

THE
CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN.

No. IX.—SEPTEMBER, 1879.

ARE WE DRIFTING?

THE answers are manifold. Scientific and sophist, gnostic and agnostic, sceptical and scriptural—they become confused and confusing. By every motive which concerns public and personal welfare we are challenged to discriminate sharply, to ascertain which of all is authorised and trustworthy. If we are to abandon our moorings and drift, or if the bonds are already snapped, it is high time to know it and prepare for the worst. If, on the other hand, we are advancing, we should take our bearings, and reassure ourselves of the direction and the guidance.

If this question were addressed to the Church, the answer would perhaps be ready. As Presbyterians, we might promptly reply.—Never was our Church more loyal to her standards, more settled in Christian principles and polity and purpose, more intolerant of essential error, more tolerant of essential truth. But the question has a wider range. It is not merely whether our Church is true to her standards, but whether the foundations themselves are destroyed by the swirl of progress or regress, and clinging Church and toppling standards and conservative government and social organisation and public morality are all dislodged and afloat. In the light of revelation, the course is clear—never clearer than now. In common with the Church of the living God, evermore we hold the Christian faith not as old or new, but as vital and veritable, centering in Christ—the personal, historic Christ—as the Messiah predicted, and so Divinely attested; in whose perfect merit, we see the way of salvation; in whose perfect teaching, we have the truth; in whose perfect person and character, we have at once the life and the supreme model of moral excellence; in a word, the Christ of whom the Scriptures testify as the way, the truth, and the life.

Throughout the Revelation there runs the gracious doctrine of redemption, like the keynote in music giving tone to the entire chord, and blending all into harmony. Redemption from sin, originated not

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

by the sinner but by the Saviour, expresses superhuman love in fullest measure moving first to rescue from human guilt and woe, and involves at once superhuman origin, agency, means, and result. This paramount and essential doctrine of Scripture is in perfect keeping with the predictions concerning the Redeemer—in keeping with the person and character of the Christ. And this is the point we make, that this doctrine of redemption, above the capacity of man to invent, is above the authority of man to modify or annul. This redemption from sin and guilt, with superhuman agency and with practical result, penetrates the character, regenerating and renewing it in holiness after the image of Christ, the perfect model. And so it should be, as it is declared in the Scriptures to be, an abiding truth in theology, a permanent arrangement in human history.

Whilst in accord with Christian faith, Christian literature for eighteen hundred years (the best literature the world has ever known) has found in Divine Revelation the needed and real relief, and has wisely and reverently accepted it, the "Hellenism" of very recent "Literature and Dogma" has made the attempt to furnish an improvement or substitute. With what success this attempt has been made is apparent in the admission that there must be some help external—"some power that makes for righteousness." When we would know its name and nature, the answer is this lofty negation,—"The eternal *not-ourselves* that makes for righteousness." And this, by the author's careful explanation, is neither person nor thing, satisfying not even classic mountain-labour, but actually and only nothing—eternal nothing.

While Christian philosophy, recent and distant, has found in this Revelation the needed and real relief, and has wisely and cordially embraced it, recent unchristian philosophy has made a profound attempt to furnish an improvement or substitute, with this result,—Pessimism, Pessimism everywhere, imposed by omnipresent will at once resistless and malignant—a power devoid of love, devoid of liberty—a substitute devoid of help or hope. Sin, guilt, ruin oppressing the human race,—with no relief from love,—intensified, rather, by resistless hate.

Akin to these aims—the literary and philosophic—is the moral expedient of the most recent type, which would deduce conscience from natural history, evolve ethics from experience, and reduce morality to mere utility. Conscience, thus, would be solely prudential, guided only by experience of the greater gratification; and, as the survival of the fittest, might would be right. The morality of the brute would thus be the same in kind as the morality of the man, with no possible distinction but the degree of gratification, which, perhaps at times, perhaps often-times, might preponderate in favour of the brute.

By such a theory, where there could be possible entrance for a Saviour does not appear. It does not indeed appear that sin itself or guilt could enter, since man, like the brute, would follow in the line

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1870.]

of greatest gratification, and would follow thus by necessary law,—conscience itself upbraiding him if he did not.

Of these literary and philosophic and moral theories, the legitimate social resultant is Communism. That it should spread rapidly under the spasmodic stimulus of this threefold activity were to be expected. Under such a theory of morals, it is encouraged to organise and concentrate its numerical force, until its might shall give it the right to universal piracy and plunder. If gratification is virtue, and if this is the guiding principle by which experience evolves a prudential conscience, then the impulse of moral force suberves the violence of numerical force to sweep on unchecked by anything from within itself. But if, in addition to this, the philosophy of Pessimism prevail, then it is challenged from without to do its very worst, in full accord with higher hate where supreme malignant might gives supreme malignant right.

By such a moral and philosophic theory of right practically applied in communistic Socialism, "the eternal not-ourselves that makes for righteousness" would become more than a hundred-headed hydra, even a myriad monster; and "the sweet reasonableness" of "Hellenism" would see in its own adherents not mere "Philistines," as it sneeringly styled England's great middle class, but a reckless, resistless, uncounted commune! So Communism would try the expedient of universal levelling, striking down equally on the right hand and on the left, capital and conscience; rejecting the Saviour and salvation; denying, and, if it were possible, arresting even God Himself!

But, pressing farther still, another and extreme expedient has been proposed, even Nihilism, precipitating not only all else but even itself into the maelstrom of final nothingness or ultimate ruin! This is the extreme pole to which we come in a direct line from its opposite—"the eternal not-ourselves" of "Hellenism," after we have followed the semi-circle in order to designate the five expedients or points of aberration: the Literary, the Philosophic, the Naturalistic, the Communistic, the Nihilistic; or, Hellenism, Pessimism, Naturalism, Socialism, Nihilism.

The spectre of Nihilism is not a mere fancy. At the present time, it is threatening the peace and safety of a great empire, and vexing with fear of change the mightiest monarch of the world. What does it propose? Fatal negation; disregard of all law and order; denying all right and all authority; counting as nothing not only the State and the Church, but Christ and Christianity; blotting out the future as a blank, and regarding the present as fit only to become a blank.

Are we drifting? There are those who *desire* it; some impelled by mischievous, some by misguided motives. There are those who are *labouring to achieve* it; some reckless of consequences; some idle hands with nothing else to do, and readily tempted; some disappointed, some ambitious leaders; some working with mad frenzy, some with deliberate malice; some by instinct and habit disorganisers, ever hostile to settled order, ever intent upon the work of destruction; some

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.

who of faith have made shipwreck, and chilled by negation,—faithless at once and hopeless with despondent spasms of denial,—strike alike friends and foes.

There are those who *assert that we are adrift*, not only with cable sundered and anchor lost, but with lights extinguished, at the mercy of the gathering tempest, on a dark and raging sea. The unfriendly desire, the hostile effort, the ominous assertion challenge attention. If the assertion be true, it were supremely sad and pitiful—pitiful to friends and foes, to be engulfed in the maelstrom, fathomless and accelerating, of Scepticism and Communism and Nihilism and Pessimism, benumbed with doubt, tossed with tumultuous socialistic passion, whirled into breathless vacuity, and mocked and smitten by relentless and irrational will or by unconscious impersonal malevolence.

In reply to such assertion we repeat the question—Are we drifting? Every good desire would prompt a denial. Every friend of humanity should labour to avert it. Every earnest voice should be raised in prayer to prevent it.

The present confusion is closely connected (as we have seen), with Nihilism, Pessimism, Naturalism, and Hellenism. Yet these are rather developments which, together with the consequent confusion, are traceable to less evident but more disastrous causes.

We do not find these causes to be (as some have hastily assumed), Christianity, Philosophy, and Science. We deny that scientific investigation, philosophical research, and Scriptural Christianity are hostile to each other or to public peace and progress. On the contrary, we maintain that true science, real philosophy, and pure Christianity are lawful and law-abiding; are friends to each other and to humanity, promoting public peace and prosperity; at once conservative and progressive; loyal to reason, both human and Divine.

The less evident but more disastrous causes to which we refer are—First, *Perverted Christianity*; and second, *Extreme Speculation, physical and psychical*; speculation appearing, on the one hand, in the guise of science, and culminating in *materialistic dogmatism and disagreement*; on the other hand, in the guise of philosophy, and culminating in *agnostic denial*.

Examining this last-named cause, we shall hope to show that we are not helplessly drifting; that we cannot finally drift; that the laws of thought and of things, the facts of history, the constitution and environment of our rational being, the Divine plan and purpose—all forbid.

The primary question raised by philosophic Agnosticism is—Can we really know anything? It has a twofold aspect—subjective and objective. Although an old question, it has its modern phases; and is as earnestly pressed by minute philosophers in recent as in remote times, and, perhaps, with equal occasion.

Agnostic philosophising returns a negative reply to this primary question. Thinkers of a certain school have been so long and so

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

persistently asserting—We really know nothing—that one begins to believe it, not only of that school, but well-nigh of himself. As if really knowing this, while certainly knowing nothing else, these theorisers have formally taught and actively disseminated Agnosticism. This theory would destroy all knowledge and truth; all assurance of being, of personality, of rights, of reality. God, man, the universe,—all must disappear from knowledge, or rather, with all knowledge disappear; and, in their stead, universal scepticism, irreverence, and lawlessness must come. In the consequent confusion, agnostic speculation is utterly incompetent to eject or resist the spectres it has summoned. They will not down at its bidding. Unbelief, Negativism, Pessimism, Nihilism assert their legitimate lineage; and, as in Milton's picture of death returning to violate and rend material sin, so these spectres haunt Agnosticism. If these foes be expelled, if this dire confusion be allayed, and a course of safety be found, it must be by other means than agnostic denial. This inevitable conclusion, with strange emphasis, recalls the primary question—Can we really know anything?

To test the denial of Agnosticism, and the better to expose its fallacy, we ask the question—Can we know ourselves as existing? We pause even to discuss the question. We are thinking upon it, feeling an intense interest in the reply, confidently expecting it to be affirmative. These are significant phenomena ("appearances"),—thinking, feeling, expecting, discussing. There cannot be appearances without something to appear, something adequate to produce the appearances (Herbert Spencer). This principle which Mr. Spencer has so elaborately rescued from the wreck of agnostic logic, every man—every child—knows as well as he, and promptly acts upon as an axiom or primitive judgment, thanking no philosopher for the power or the privilege to do so.

While we are giving time to this question—whether we ourselves exist, the great mass of mankind, not merely "the Philistines," but the Hellenists also, are unhesitatingly affirming it and acting upon the affirmation. In the distant past, to which the knights-errant of Agnosticism and of "Literature and Dogma" are so wont to turn for guidance, the philosopher boldly announced the practical precept, "Know thyself." Wisely addressed, as it was, to men, they no less wisely received it, traced it on temple-arch and on the written page, and not merely taught it, but transmitted it to be taught to all posterity.

Not only is the knowledge of self as existing thus affirmed by the individual consciousness, and by the common consciousness of mankind, it is necessitated by the very laws of thought.

The primary law of thought is, the recognition of existence—the existence of the thinker—and, then, of the act of thinking. The very term—*cogito*—I think—I am thinking—obeys and illustrates this law of thought. This appears in the first and simplest judgment which the child or the man can make—as, I see, I feel, I hear—I am seeing, I am

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

feeling, I am hearing. So the laws of language and of logic illustrate and confirm this primary law of thought.

By the law of language, then, the law of logic, and the law of thought; by the common consciousness, and the individual consciousness, we are compelled to this certain conclusion, the knowledge of self as existing, thinking, acting; the knowledge of the actor and the acting, conjoined yet distinguished in the same cognition—I am thinking.

And, yet, in this nineteenth century of the Christian era, we are gravely told by some wise know-nothings that “the very cognition of self is impossible, for if the object perceived is self, what is the subject that perceives it?” Therefore, “We cannot know ourselves.” Therefore “self-knowledge is forbidden by the nature of thought” (Herbert Spencer). To such logic, we are ostentatiously treated in the name of science. With such logic, thoughtful men address other men. By such logic, our spiritual life, our very self is ruthlessly exposed to keener blades than those of “Philistines.” By such logic, the logician himself is slain. However wise under the circumstances such suicide may be, it is at least cruel. Lest the slaughter become indiscriminate, we protest against the logic, and insist that it be placed under stringent control.

But while we protest, the frenzied blow is aimed not only against ourselves but against knowledge too; and the fatal climax is reached, that “nothing can be really known.” Whether this be profoundest sense or nonsense, one thing at least is certain, such logic would snap every bond and send knowledge and being alike adrift into the darkness and the storm—would send them over frightful rapids into the relentless vortex of the unknown and unknowable!

But such a climax, however rash, is neither new nor original. Sophists thus theorised before the days of Hume or Herbert Spencer—even Hellenic sophists; and yet lived on unconvinced, despite their own logic, sneering at their own sophistry.

Over against this, be it the logic of science or of nescience, we record not only the intellectual precept of the Greek, “Know thyself,” but the Christian precept, both intellectual and practical; “Examine yourselves . . . prove your own selves;” and that profound interrogation and affirmation, “For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the spirit of God.” In accordance with such exalted precept and principle, let each look into his own mind, and write.

But the laws of thought, as well as the facts of consciousness bear us to other inevitable certainties: that there cannot be thought without content; that in every thought there shall be implied a thinker, a thinking, and a theme; that while knowledge begins in the conscious mind, this is also the percipient and so recipient mind. Thus we are borne by the laws of thought to objective realities. There is a law of things, making them subjects of knowledge to the percipient mind,

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

constituting definite, mutual relations between the knower and the known. There is the conscious recognition of real external phenomena, in a real external world, the same real world for all knowing minds. The phenomenal and the substantial are conjoined inseparably. Both are real, and are real subjects of knowledge.

Agnosticism is not only condemned to self-adjudged silence, but is refuted and exposed. From these laws of thought and of things, we cannot divest ourselves. Everywhere they attend us, to guide, to assure, to hold us. Hence we cannot, if we would, drift in the direction of agnostic denial.

R. B. WELCH.

THE PRINCESS ELIZABETH, QUEEN OF BOHEMIA.*

IT is perhaps not surprising that little should now be known even among the educated classes of Britain and America, of the eventful life of the Princess Elizabeth, eldest daughter of James VI. and I., although, as the grand-daughter of the beautiful Mary Stuart, and the grandmother of George I., she is a main link in the connection of Queen Victoria with the Tudor and Stuart dynasties. As a Protestant heroine, and specially as the instrument of raising much common interest between the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland and Bohemia, the Princess Elizabeth surely deserves to be still remembered by the Presbyterian world, and in proposing to occupy a few pages in this ecclesiastical journal with a brief sketch of her career, we feel that we are not introducing a subject foreign to the aims which our journal has in view.

James had two palaces in Fife, and each of these has claimed to have been the birth-place of Elizabeth. It is likely, however, that the birth took place, on 16th August, 1596, at Falkland, the celebrated hunting-seat of the Stuart kings, while the claims of Dunfermline may have arisen from the fact that the council at which the arrangements for the baptism were made, was held there on the 29th of September following. In accordance with these arrangements, Elizabeth was baptised at Holyrood House on 28th November of the same year, the English ambassador, on behalf of the godmother, Queen Elizabeth, holding the child in his arms, and the herald afterwards quaintly proclaiming her style and title as "Lady Elizabeth, first daughter of Scotland." James and his queen speedily committed the custody and training of the infant Princess to Lord Livingstone—afterwards created Earl of Linlithgow—and his wife, a

* This sketch is drawn mainly from the "Memoirs of Elizabeth Stuart, Queen of Bohemia," by Miss Benger, 2 vols.; London, Longman & Co., 1825; and the "Lives of the Princesses of England," by Mary Anne Everett Green; London, 1854. Vols. V. and VI. The original State papers, &c., are fully cited in these, particularly in the latter work.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1870.]

course which met with the emphatic disapproval of the General Assembly, who appointed a day of humiliation on account of many evils—among others, “the education of their Majesty’s children in the company of professed, avowed, and obstinate Papists, such as the Ladie Livingstone.”* Lord Livingstone, however, was a Protestant, and promised the Assembly to deal with his wife; and we shall see, from the sequel, the Princess escaped without imbibing anti-Protestant doctrines. The Princess remained under charge of the Livingstones until after the succession of her father to the English throne, when she was transferred for a very short time to the care of the Countess of Kildare, and ultimately to Lord Harrington, to whom, and to whose lady, she appears to have been largely indebted for the godly Protestant training which ennobled her whole character and career. The first little grief of her life which her biographers record, arose from her separation from her brother Henry, Prince of Wales, which took place when she was committed to Lord Harrington’s care, and the episode shows the deeply affectionate heart of the child,—a trait of character which she developed more and more as she advanced in years, and which is the more pleasing as it is only conspicuous by its absence in the case of several of the other members of her family. While still a child, she escaped playing a prominent part in the revolution devised by Catesby, and the other originators of the famous Gunpowder Plot, by the timely discovery of that horrible conspiracy. The plan of Catesby and his associates is said to have been to take Elizabeth by force and proclaim her queen in room of her father, whom they doomed to destruction, along with his sons and Parliament. They hoped that the name “Elizabeth” would be so acceptable to the people, who delighted in what, in the phraseology of the times, was styled “the savoury memory” of the late queen, as greatly to facilitate their design; and they arranged that some of their party should take possession of the Princess’s person on the day appointed for the execution of the plot. Lord Harrington was in some way set on his guard, and most luckily had the Princess removed to Coventry for safety, for as those of the conspirators who were to have made the capture did not know of the discovery and failure of their comrades in London, she certainly would have fallen into their hands but for this precaution. The child’s feelings towards the Catholics cannot but have been affected by this incident, and it also seems to have had the effect of imparting a precocious sobriety to her mind. “I doubt not,” she wrote to Prince Henry, “you have rendered thanks to our good God for the deliverance He has given us, as I have done, and still do, for my part. But I wish to join my vows with yours, and to say with you, ‘If the Lord be for us, who can be against us?’ In His keeping, I will not fear what man can do.” Occasionally we find that she visited London with Lord Harrington’s family, and enjoyed the renewal of personal intercourse with her brother, Prince Henry. It is said that when in London in 1609, the Prince and

* Row’s “History of the Kirk of Scotland.” Wodrow Edition, p. 206.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

Princess studied history together, Henry singling out Henry of Navarre as his model of a Protestant king, and frequently discussing with his sister the prospects of Protestantism, which they mutually pledged themselves never to renounce. At this period she acquired the art of horsemanship, and the thoroughly English taste for hunting, in which she excelled so much as to delight and astonish the Germans, into whose society her marriage brought her in after-years.

We need not cumber our narrative to detail the political negotiations which resulted in bringing the Elector Palatine, Frederick V. to England, with the avowed object of suing for Elizabeth's hand. In both England and Scotland the people at large had still, in the recollection of the Armada, the persecutions with which the name of Mary was associated at home, and the cruelties inflicted on the brave inhabitants of the Low Countries, a vivid sense of the dangers which were likely to arise from the re-establishment of a papal power, and they hailed with unmixed satisfaction the prospect of the proposed match, by which it was expected the interests of Protestantism would be much advanced.

The Elector, who was of the same age as the Princess, is described as possessed of a pleasing presence and agreeable manner, and notwithstanding the disfavour of the queen, he soon became very popular in King James's Court. He appeared in London with the full pomp of a feudal potentate, and was entertained most magnificently by the king. The marriage was solemnised with great splendour on 14th February, 1613, and for two months following the Elector and his wife were feted and amused at the most extravagant outlay, with tedious formality and display. After a short stay in Holland, Frederick and his bride proceeded to the Palatinate, where rejoicings on a very large and elaborate scale were held in honour of their union. The festivities ended, Frederick assumed the administration of his territory, which, since his father's death, had been conducted by the Duke of Deuxponts, and for the next six years reigned at Heidelberg, enjoying comparative ease and comfort. His domestic happiness during this period was uninterrupted, and both Elizabeth and he must have regarded these years as their haleyon days. While devoting himself to Elizabeth with an enthusiastic love, which was fully reciprocated, he did not waste his time in mere sentiment or gaiety, but, along with his wife, watched with deepest interest the grand questions of the times. Frederick, soon after his marriage, was recognised as chief of the Evangelical Union—a confederacy of Protestant princes associated for the purpose of mutual defence. The Protestant dread of the Spaniards and Austrians, in which the French largely participated, the German dread of the preponderance of the Hapsburg family, with the counter-feelings on the part of Spain and Austria, but most of all, perhaps, the individual ambition of the reigning princes, combined to keep the political life of Europe in a state of feverish excitement. Frederick and Elizabeth, while not themselves the originators of any of the many schemes which were proposed, had their

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

full share in the anxiety of the times, and were wrought upon by the influence, not only of his uncles Maurice of Nassau and the Duc de Bouillon, but also of the zealous Calvinist, Abraham Sculleton, who occupied the post of private chaplain to the Elector. These influences all tended to excite Frederick's ambition towards an advancement of his own position to be effected by the Protestant Alliance, by which he would be raised to a position of equality with the highest Catholic princes. By the year 1618 Bohemia had become the centre of interest to politicians, and we must glance for a moment at the history of that country to enable us to follow the fortunes of Elizabeth.

The throne of Bohemia appears from the earliest authentic records to have been elective, history recording several instances in which the States of Bohemia chose their king. It would seem that no special election was considered necessary on the death of a sovereign who left male issue; but the new king was required to swear to protect the constitution, and most solemnly to acknowledge that he wore the crown by the free choice of the Bohemians. In the year 1618, Ferdinand II., during the life of his predecessor, had got himself elected King of Bohemia by underhand means, and this unconstitutional proceeding had greatly irritated the Bohemians, already indignant at the growing oppression of the Government, which, even in Matthias's time, had fallen more and more under the hands of the Jesuits,—a change which no Protestant people could view with complacency. The complaint of the Bohemian States having been treated by the Emperor with contempt, the enraged deputies, in a moment of exasperation, threw the Regents, Slawata and Martinitz, along with their secretary, from a window of the ancient palace of the Bohemian kings on the Hradecchin, at Prague. Notwithstanding the great height (fully sixty feet) from which they were thrown, having alighted on a dunghill, they all escaped with their lives; but the incident was felt by all parties to have been the "casting of the die," and it is commonly spoken of as the origin of the Thirty Years' War.* The Bohemians forthwith formed a provisional administration of thirty directors, of whom Count Thurn was the leading spirit, and swore to maintain their constitution. Finding negotiations with Vienna likely to lead to no good, they soon appointed the celebrated Count Mansfeldt to organise their army, and prepared to assert their rights by the sword. Their temper was brought to the highest pitch when, on the death of Matthias, it was found that by his will he had presumed to bequeath their kingdom, failing Ferdinand and his heirs, to Spain. Actual hostilities could no longer be avoided, "rebellion was hallowed."

Such was the position of matters when the States of Bohemia chose the Elector Frederick V. as their king. His own mind being clouded with doubts and conflicting counsels, it may be regarded as certain that Frederick would not have accepted the offered crown but for the influ-

* A very succinct account of the causes which led to the Thirty Years' War is given by Motley in his *Life of Barneveldt*.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

ence of the bold and romantic spirit of his wife, who urged him not only by the goads of glory and ambition, but still more by the consideration of his duty as a champion of Protestantism, and protector of his persecuted co-religionists. On receiving the formal intimation of his election, Frederick wrote Elizabeth from Amberg for her opinion. In her reply, she said : "Since you are persuaded that the throne to which you are invited is a vocation from God, by whose providence are all things ordained and directed, then, assuredly, you ought not to shrink from the duty imposed ; nor, if such be your persuasion, shall I repine, whatever consequences may issue—not even though I should be forced to part with my last jewel, and to suffer actual hardships, shall I ever repent of the election." And so it came about that Frederick and Elizabeth, after solemn religious services, took farewell of Heidelberg, and proceeded to Prague as King and Queen of Bohemia.

The reception accorded to Frederick and his wife by the Bohemian nobles was most cordial, and the populace welcomed them with no less enthusiasm. Elizabeth's manners and appearance completely took the hearts of the people, inspiring, we are told, sentiments of "impassioned affection" towards herself. On the 3rd of November, 1619, Frederick was crowned King of Bohemia, with great ceremony, and three days afterwards his consort received her queenly diadem with equal pomp. In the following month Elizabeth gave birth to a son, who was named Rupert, and is so well-known in English history as the gallant cavalry leader of the Royalists during the Civil War.

From the moment that Frederick accepted the Bohemian crown, he must have been burdened by anxieties and disappointments to an extent rarely exceeded, and if during his winter's reign in Prague he bore himself cheerfully, he was indebted much to the courage and hopefulness of his wife for his appearance of fortitude. The conduct of his father-in-law, James, must have been his chief burden. Eager to obtain for his son, Charles, the hand of the Spanish Infanta, James deserted at once his daughter's husband and the cause of Protestantism, of which he was the avowed supporter, and became, for a time, but a tool in the hand of the Spanish politicians.* Frederick's expectation of help from France was also cut off, and he was thus left with very meagre support. Meanwhile Austrian and Bavarian armies entered Bohemia, while a Spanish army was ready at a moment's notice to invade the Palatinate. The position was made more critical by the want of tact which led Frederick to give the chief command in his army to German generals, who were viewed with jealousy by the Bohemian nobles, and by indiscreet zeal in asserting Calvinistic views, which were disagreeable to the Lutheran as much as to the Catholic portion of his subjects. Rapidly events rolled on, each day making Frederick's prospects darker and darker, until the crisis was reached on 20th November, 1620, when the Bohemian army, commanded by Prince Anhalt and Count Hohenloe,

* Rushworth's testimony on this point is very striking. Collection, vol. i. p. 1.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

was defeated on the White Hill, within sight of the ramparts of Prague, by Maximilian of Bavaria, Marshals Burquoy and Tilly. Frederick now resolved on flight, and next morning he fled to Breslau, carrying with him his wife and children. His conduct has often been described as cowardly, but when it is considered that he was not himself a military leader, that he had tested his own inability to maintain successfully the position he had tried to occupy, that he could make appeal to the tradition and natural feelings of the Bohemians only through the medium of a foreign language, and only on the point of their constitution,—an appeal which would address itself more to the reason than the feelings of the people, and which it was therefore useless to attempt at such a moment,—and that he had still his native Principality to endeavour to retain, he may, we think, be discharged of the imputation, especially as his personal courage was afterwards fully proved in the course of the wars.

Flying from Prague during the storms of winter and under the perils of war, Frederick and his wife suffered actual hardships before they reached Breslau, where they halted for a short time, but long enough to find how completely the Bohemians, dispirited and divided, were now content to submit to Ferdinand, and trust his Jesuitical promises. The trials of exiles multiplied upon the devoted couple. During their flight Elizabeth was confined at the Castle of Custrin, where Prince Maurice, whose name is usually associated with that of his brother Rupert, was born on 25th December, 1620. Journeying on to Holland, the royal fugitives at length reached The Hague, which was to be their home for so many years. Busy negotiations were during this period carried on by or for Frederick, but his fatal indecision rendered them fruitless to effect the recovery of his lost dominions. The popularity of Elizabeth meanwhile, stimulated by sympathy for her misfortunes, increased apace, and the common saying was that "Elizabeth in default of other subjects was certainly Queen of Hearts." The Dutch States, regarding Frederick as a sufferer in the common cause of freedom against tyranny and papal oppression, made him an allowance for his support, and thus the strange anomaly was exhibited of a German Prince of ancient lineage bred to exercise the Divine right of kings in the most absolute manner, living as a pensioner on the free-will of a Republican country. Unpalatable as his new position must have been, Frederick's feelings were exposed to another wrench when he heard of the terrible doings of Ferdinand's officers in Bohemia. In the face of the most solemn promise, made only to allure the victims to their destruction, the Emperor commenced the severest persecution of modern times by the execution at Prague of twenty-five leading nobles, knights, and citizens, on 21st June, 1621, and who, while nominally condemned as rebels against Ferdinand, undoubtedly earned the martyr's crown and showed the martyr's spirit, while some of their late fellows earned pardon by recantation of Protestantism.

And now if we were to go fully into the history of Elizabeth, we should

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

be obliged to plunge into the almost inextricable details of the Thirty Years' War. That, however, would not only lead us beyond the limit of our space, but be foreign to our purpose of sketching merely the personal history of our heroine. The chivalrous devotion of many of the Protestant leaders, and, indeed, of whole brigades, to the cause of the Queen of Bohemia, was a marked feature of the war, and exercised an influence which appears in this non-enthusiastic age barely credible; Christian of Brunswick particularly distinguished himself by such devotion to his royal relative. During a visit to The Hague, he met Elizabeth for the first time, and forthwith changed the scroll on his colours, substituting for his former motto, "God's Friend; Foe to the Priesthood," the words, "For God and for her." This gallantry, aiding his own fame as a warrior, and the popularity of the cause in which he was engaged, drew many English and Scottish volunteers to his standard, who greatly distinguished themselves by bravery and military skill.

Passing from the saddening details of the struggle, we find that during the earlier years of the war Elizabeth lived quietly in Holland, and though she had much to try her, yet, in the circle of her own family, she had comfort and happiness. Frederick, whatever his failures or faults as a ruler, was a thoroughly domestic man, and in him and their children Elizabeth at this time had at once a solace for the past and hope for the future. Wave after wave of trial was, however, still to break upon her, and to wash away literally every earthly comfort. In 1625 the first breach in her family occurred by the death of her infant son Louis, whom she describes as "the pretiest childe I had." The death of her father and of her kind friend the Prince of Orange also took place in the same year. While deplored with affectionate effusiveness the loss of her father, she seems to have expected more liberal assistance from her brother Charles, but here again the hopes which she cherished, which were but natural and moderate, were doomed to bitter disappointment, Charles's conduct towards her being but indifferent. In 1628, as every hope seemed to dissolve, Elizabeth acceded to the wishes of Frederick, who transferred his diminished Court from "The Hague" to Rheten, in the province of Utrecht. They were not, however, to be allowed long-continued happiness in their new home. In 1629 a heavy blow fell on them in the loss of their eldest son, Prince Henry Frederick, who was drowned in the Zuyderzee while accompanying his father to visit some Spanish galleons lately captured by the Dutch fleet. This sad bereavement unnerved Frederick so completely that for the next two years he ceased to take an active part in his own political affairs, and never afterwards recovered his former spirits. Elizabeth had several friends in the English diplomatic service, and carried on a correspondence which must have frequently inflated her hopes, but, in the end, only intensified her disappointments. The correspondence, however, shows more than once the constancy of her attachment to Protestantism. Thus, Charles I. having suggested that her eldest surviving son should be educated a Catholic,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

in the hope that the Emperor would restore to him his father's territories, Elizabeth indignantly exclaimed, "Rather than stoop to such an act of meanness, she would with her own hands become her son's executioner."

The exploits of Gustavus now dazzled Europe, and rekindled for the last time the flickering hopes of the banished Elector. Leaving Holland early in the year 1632, he joined the Swedish King with 2500 Dutch soldiers granted by the States, and a number of British volunteers, including Lord Craven, who entered into the war with the same chivalrous spirit as Christian of Brunswick, and continued to the end Elizabeth's devoted servant and friend.

The defeat of Tilly at Leipsic in September, 1631, and again at the passage of the Lech on 5th April, 1632, when the veteran marshal got his death-wound, must have increased Frederick's hopes, but the delays which followed, pending Gustavus's negotiations with the wily Wallenstein, tried his patience sorely. We find him at this time writing Elizabeth, thanking her for her punctual letters, but complaining sadly of "the tedious uncertainty that awaits our movements."

Meanwhile Frederick visited the Palatinate, and while surrounded by happy friends and subjects now hopeful of his restoration, he was prostrated by an attack of the fever which had long hung about him. In this critical state of health, the news of the victory of Lutzen came, but coupled as the victory was with the death of the brave Gustavus, Frederick regarded it rather as a defeat. He had lost the friend and ally on whom his forlorn hopes depended; he had no strength for further struggles, and succumbed at Mayence on 17th November, 1632, in the thirty-sixth year of his age. "To the last moment," we are told, "his thoughts dwelt on his heroic consort, who, with unequalled generosity, had braved for him the frowns and persecutions of fortune, and who, in every trial, had administered hope and consolation." The bereavement fell all the more heavily on Elizabeth that it was quite unexpected, Frederick having disguised from her the serious nature of his illness. As she had viewed him as just on the point of being reinstated in the Palatinate, the dashing to pieces of her hopes, while thus on the stretch of expectation, would have borne down the spirit of any ordinary woman. Strengthening herself, however, in Almighty God, "her first great resource," she petitioned the States of Holland for a continuance to herself and children of their protection, stating in her memorial—"It is for you to receive those who have been persecuted for the sake of righteousness and truth. You refuse not succour to the destitute and persecuted, therefore, to your friendship, in his last moments, did my consort consign me and my bereaved children."

As the mother of the young Elector Palatine, as the sister of the King of England, the niece of the King of Denmark, and nearly related to many of the other reigning families, Elizabeth exercised, during the early years of her widowhood, an influence in the diplomacy of the time which entered

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

as an element into every political negotiation. To further the claim of her son to the principality of his ancestors, she strained every nerve, and her voluminous correspondence with diplomatists, which has mostly been preserved, forms a monument of industry, tact, and courageous perseverance. Constantly harassed, not merely with the anxiety attending these efforts, but, with what to her royal spirit must have been more distressing, the difficulty of obtaining an adequate maintenance for herself and her now reduced Court, her life, indeed, was not to be envied. The civil war in England soon deprived her brother of the means of helping her, and although the Parliamentarians for sometime gave her supplies, they were so provoked by her devotion to her unfortunate brother that they declined all further aid. So great, on some occasions, were her straits, that one of her biographers hardly exaggerates when she thus writes: “‘I had rather feed on a dry crust at a king’s table than feast on dainties at that of an elector,’ had been her proud exclamation, five and thirty years ago, when urging her husband to accept his ill-fated crown, and now she knew what it was not only to eat a dry crust, but to beg it before she ate it.”

During the progress of the war in England Elizabeth experienced a succession of family trials. In 1644 the hand of death removed her mother-in-law, the godly Juliana, and the following year brought a bitter trial in the renunciation of Protestantism by her son Edward, who, while he was rewarded at the time by the hand of a French princess, thus lost for himself and his descendants the triple crown of Great Britain and Ireland. More bitter grief was caused to Elizabeth by the disgrace of her son Philip, who, avenging a private insult by the deliberate murder of the offender, was obliged to fly to France, and after wandering for some years in exile, was killed in battle in 1658.

The execution of her brother, King Charles, in 1649 was itself a crushing blow, but Elizabeth’s heart, bleeding from regard for her brother, whom she loved to the end, notwithstanding his insincerity and coldness, was wrung by anxieties long kept in suspense for her favourite sons, Rupert and Maurice. For five years Rupert led an unsettled buccaneer life, in the course of which Maurice’s ship is supposed to have foundered at sea with all on board. In September, 1651, death again entered Elizabeth’s family, removing her daughter Henrietta, who had been married to Prince Ragotzi only in the previous May.

Meanwhile, the peace of Westphalia had restored Charles Louis to the possession of the lower Palatinate; but alas! this brought no return of comfort to his mother. Most unnaturally, he not only did not bring her to Heidelberg, but he was unpunctual and parsimonious in the payment of means for her support.

The marriage of her daughter the Princess Sophia to Ernest Augustus, youngest brother of the Duke of Brunswick, afterwards Elector of Hanover, which took place in 1658, passed off without exciting much interest, no one then dreaming of the great future which was in store for the issue

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

of the match. Soon afterwards the last, and perhaps the most trying to Elizabeth of all her family distresses, alighted on her with the surprise and rapidity of lightning. One morning she found that her favourite daughter Louisa, now the sole companion of her widowed home, had fled, leaving a note which stated, "I depart for France to embrace the true faith, and to take the vows." How must the eager spirit, that for so many years had suffered so much in the cause of Protestantism, have chafed under such a trial! What a struggle there must have been between motherly affection and religious duty! But the brave spirit did not lose self-control or cheerfulness. The fugitive was traced, but the preparative training long carried on in secret, had made reasoning hopeless. Louisa was caressed by the French Court, and created Abbess Maubuission, an office which she held till her death in 1709. The restoration of Charles II. to the British throne in 1660, while it could not be but gratifying to his aunt, was darkened in its effect on her by more than one cloud, among the rest, by the sad death of the Princess Mary of Orange, who died of smallpox during the festivities with which her brother's coronation was celebrated. Elizabeth was now desirous to return to her native land, and it is painful to think that the last year of her life was embittered by the difficulties thrown in the way of this desire by her careless, pleasure-loving nephew.

The contrast between the circumstances under which she had left her early home and those under which she now returned, present as striking an instance of the uncertainty of fortune as history records. Then, the popular idol, the central figure of gay and gorgeous marriage-fêtes, surrounded by courtiers and full of life and spirits;—now shattered in health, broken-hearted, unnoticed by the populace, slighted by the courtiers, attended only by a few domestics; and, as to house-room, left to the charity of private friends.

In the autumn of 1661 her health began to fail. Little is known of her illness; but, doubtless, she bore herself with the uncomplaining fortitude which so distinguished her life. Her release from suffering took place on 13th February, 1662, and on 1st March following her remains were interred, with royal honours, in Westminster Abbey.

The sketch we have given of Elizabeth's career, imperfect as it is, will yet, we hope, suffice to explain how the Princess Royal of Great Britain came to be styled "The afflicted Queen of Bohemia"; and how the Presbyterians of Scotland were so deeply interested in her cause, as to order special prayers to be offered on her behalf.* Of these prayers, which were doubtless earnest,—for once roused, the feeling of the Scottish heart is very strong,—may we not regard the events that brought her grandson to the throne of Britain, and that have given her royal descendants so wonderful a career, as a providential answer?

* *Vide* "The Directory for Public Worship approved by the General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, 1645."

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1870.]

Her unfortunate position was brought very prominently before the Scotch in several ways, particularly by the levying of what were termed "voluntary contributions" for the war in the Palatinate in the early stages of the struggle, and by the large number of Scotchmen who, with the Marquis of Hamilton, Lord Reay, and others, crossed to Germany to serve under Gustavus.

Naturally of a gay disposition, Elizabeth retained a cheerful tone until within a very short time of her death, animating and encouraging all who came into contact with her. This leading feature of her character, regulated, as it was, by her deep affection for her relations, and her attachment to Protestantism, gave her, in those days of personal rule, an influence over statesmen and generals the importance of which the great democracies of Britain and America, accustomed to constitutional Government, can with difficulty realise; but, undoubtedly, it entitles her to a high place among the chief actors on the stage of European history during the seventeenth century.

Two portraits of Elizabeth may be seen in the National Portrait Gallery, Kensington. The features bear a strong family resemblance to her brother, Charles I., but indicate a more open and vivacious disposition.

The discovery of a holograph letter from Elizabeth among the valuable collection of MSS. bequeathed by the late David Laing, LL.D., to the University of Edinburgh, enables us to append a facsimile of her subscription, written very shortly after her marriage:—

*From Hyldeberg the
29 of Jan 1613.*



EDUCATIONAL POLICY IN INDIA.

IT is a standing reproach to Great Britain, that though it has been entrusted by Providence with the government of many millions in India, all whose interests depend, humanly speaking, on the justice, wisdom, and humanity of its rule, having no power of self-government or self-help, nor even of making their grievances known in the event of mistake or wrong on our part, so little interest is taken in this subject, that it is hardly possible to get any attention given to it in Parliament, save when some terrible calamity occurs, or some party question happens to be mixed up with it. It is to be feared, too, that the Churches of

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

Christ are in like manner to blame for a grievous lack of intelligent interest in our Indian Empire, in those aspects of it with which, as Churches, they have specially to do. There is, indeed, a general acknowledgment of the importance of missionary labour in that field, and a knowledge, more or less distinct, of the character of its religious and social systems, and of the modes of missionary labour among them ; there is a desire to hear of conversions among the natives of India, and delight when these can be announced : but there is little or nothing of that study of the details of the problem to be solved, and of the way of its solution, that a real human interest in the subject, as one with which we have ourselves practically to deal, would assuredly call forth. The particulars of Indian affairs seem to be as repellent to leaders in ecclesiastical as in political business at home. Such a state of matters, however, is neither right nor safe in the Church any more than in the State. Unless the home Church, through her leading men, really sets herself to understand and keep in mind the peculiar conditions and problems of the Christianisation of India, she does not give her missionaries in that field the sympathy and encouragement they ought to get, nor can she hope to get her young men practically to feel that she is as thoroughly in earnest, and as convinced of the importance of the work as she professes to be. What, for example, could be more dangerous to the hearty prosecution of the missionary work, or more discouraging to labourers in and aspirants to that work, than what took place two years ago in connection with the Free Church educational work ; when certain statements by a professor in one of the Government colleges, led to a long newspaper correspondence, in which not only outsiders but members and ministers of the Church expressed serious doubts and suspicions as to the Church's mission policy as a whole ? Surely, if the relation of the Government colleges to mission institutions had been known as it ought to be, such doubts could not have been thus raised, or would have been at once set at rest.

These remarks have been suggested by an extremely valuable and important pamphlet by Mr. Johnston, whose title is given below.* We fear, that as it deals with details of Indian affairs, it may be laid aside by many without study, under the influence of the prevalent lack of liking for anything about India : but we would earnestly plead on its behalf for a more worthy treatment, at least a patient hearing of what the writer has to say ; and we think that the pamphlet is well fitted to give much information on the important subject of which it treats, and so to promote intelligent interest in it. That subject is the policy that ought to be pursued in regard to education in India, both by the British Government and by the Christian Churches engaged in missionary work there. It is right and necessary that the policy of both Church and

* *Our Educational Policy in India.*—A Vital Question for the Government and the Church. By the Rev. JAMES JOHNSTON, Senior Minister of St. James's Free Church, Glasgow. Edinburgh : John Maclaren & Son, 1879, pp. 63.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

State in regard to this should be considered together, for both have a duty in the matter, and the action of each ought to supplement that of the other. The conditions of the problem are of great complexity and difficulty, the political state of India being an altogether unprecedented and anomalous one. As Isaac Taylor puts it: "In India, as to the relation of the people to the Government, everything is and must long be, if not for ever, anomalous, out of harmony with all theory, exceptional as to the entire course of ordinary history. Governed from a remote centre, by a race utterly alien and abhorrent to its own, conquered and held in subjection by nothing but steel, or if by ought else, by fibres of moral influence; governed, if not with an exclusive, yet with a constant and sovereign regard to the annual fiscal result, India must, under conditions so strange (always supposing the continuance of the British supremacy) and more and more so, it must stand as a *paradox* in the large volume of human experience."^{*}

The problem from a Christian point of view is, how we, who have to govern despotically peoples of other and, as we believe, false religions, can provide for them what we can conscientiously regard as a sound education tending to good so far as it goes, while yet we do not violence to their consciences. Mr. Johnston, in a brief historical sketch of what has been done in this matter, shows that till comparatively recent times the thing was not attempted at all. He traces three stages in the course of Britain's dealing with India, in the first of which commerce, and in the second conquest was the leading, if not practically exclusive, aim of our policy; until at length, under the influence of evangelical religion in England, expressed mainly through what was called the "Clapham Sect," Zachary Macaulay and his friends, it came to be recognised, that, as rulers of India, we were bound to seek the intellectual and moral advancement of its inhabitants. This change dates from the renewal of the East India Company's charter in 1813, when, for the first time, Parliament required that a sum, only amounting to £10,000, should be devoted by the Company annually to the encouragement of education. Thus the first step was taken, amounting to a recognition that something ought to be done for the moral improvement of the natives of India, and that education was a suitable way of doing it. At the next periodic renewal of the charter in 1833, a further step was taken. Not only was the educational grant increased to £100,000, but there was a deliberate consideration and decision as to the nature of the education to be given. By that time there had been started, alongside of the old vernacular education in the Oriental languages, schools in which English was taught and made the vehicle of instruction. Begun by Hare at Calcutta, and Marshman at Serampore, in 1817-8, this method was taken up by Duff, in 1830, as an appropriate instrument of Christian evangelisation; and, after long and keen discussion, it was decided by the Government, in Macaulay's "minute" of 1835, that English rather

* "Logic in Theology, and other Essays," 1859, p. 215.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

than vernacular education, though not to the exclusion of the latter, should be promoted by State aid. Thus Church and State may be said to have kept step, here, each adopting the method of English education as suitable for its ends.

Now this, as experience has proved, was a more important step than might at first sight appear. By taking it, the Government practically declared that they held it to be consistent with their duty to aid the youth of India to an acquaintance with all the literature, philosophy, and history, as well as science of Western Europe. Now this great and valuable body of knowledge is in its influence thoroughly adverse to the religions of India, and, as we believe, when rightly used, truly favourable to Christianity. When therefore the State had resolved to give or help in giving to the people of India, not merely education in general, as was done in 1813, but, as was decided in 1835, this kind of education; it was inevitable that the question would arise, How was this to be done consistently with allowing perfect freedom of conscience to those who were to be thus taught? The principles of our Protestant Christianity forbid the use of Government schools or grants as a means of propagating our religion among heathens; and yet the principles of enlightened humanity require the teaching of that body of Western culture that is utterly antagonistic to Hinduism, and in its main spirit Christian. This may be said to be a chronic problem rather than one of any definite date; but when, on the renewal of the charter in 1853, the educational grants were put on a footing of indefinite increase, the policy of the Government in this matter was laid down in the important despatch of 1854, issued by Sir Charles Wood, and adhered to by all subsequent Governments in this country. Of that despatch, Mr. Johnston, in the pamphlet before us, gives a pretty full account, and subjoins an abstract. He thoroughly approves of its principles; and his main object is to urge that they should be more fully carried out than they have been by the Indian officials, whose course on educational matters has rather led in a direction opposite to that contemplated in the despatch of 1854.

It may be said briefly that the policy of that despatch was to solve the problem above indicated by the gradual substitution of a system of grants-in-aid for one of direct Government education. When first the State entered on the good work of English education, it was felt to be necessary that they should establish, maintain, and manage schools and colleges of their own for that purpose. Accordingly, as Mr. Johnston informs us, there were in 1854, fourteen Government colleges, besides schools, educating in all 40,000 pupils. In these, according to the principle of neutrality, there could be no religious teaching, or exposition of how the Western culture rests on, and points to Christianity. So far the Government could refrain from giving positively Christian teaching. But they could not possibly prevent the negative, anti-heathen effect of their education; and thus their neutrality could be only a half

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

thing after all. Mr. Johnston adduces abundant testimony to show, what must be well known to our readers, that an English college education almost invariably destroys all faith in Hinduism, and that where, as in the Government colleges, nothing better is brought in to fill up the void, the moral results are most pernicious, and are felt with grief and resentment by many of the native community. It is to be feared that such training is a somewhat doubtful, or at least very mixed benefit, and Government, in bestowing it, is hardly doing the best that can be done for the intellectual and moral good of the country.

The despatch of 1854 contemplated a better way of contributing to this end. Its ideal was, that instead of keeping up institutions of its own, Government should give grants in aid of other parties, maintaining and managing schools and colleges on their own responsibility. Wherever and by whomsoever a thoroughly good secular education should be given, Government would make grants-in-aid on a proportionate and equitable scale. In this way it would preserve a real neutrality, using public money only for what all agree to be a public benefit, secular education ; and not being responsible for the negative any more than for the positive influence of that education. Some of the aided institutions would be Christian, supported by the Churches, and taught in the confidence that all knowledge may be made to lead not only from idols but to Christ ; others might be Hindu, maintained by Brahminists, who might think that their religion could be harmonised with English training ; others might be purely secular, or deistic, or Mohammedan ; all would have a fair field, and no favour. This seems an eminently wise and statesmanlike theory, and a much better solution of the problem of Government education in India than the system of directly giving education purely secular in Government schools and colleges. Its advantages in respect of consistency of principle, and lessening the dangerous effects of the merely negative influence of European culture are accompanied with that of economy, and being able to do more good at an equal expenditure of money.

It was, however, a system that could not be introduced all at once, and that was never contemplated. It was impossible to dispense with Government schools and colleges in 1854 ; as without them there were no means by which education could be sufficiently given. Indeed, had it not been for the work of missionary societies, in setting up English educational institutions, it is probable that the idea of providing for the wants of the community by grants-in-aid would have seemed wholly Utopian. But the Churches had been as before going alongside of the State in this work, and were ready to fall in with the system of grants-in-aid. Besides that, many of the natives themselves had been roused to interest and efforts for the education of their countrymen. Thus, though the Government schools and colleges remained, many others, both Christian and non-Christian, came to receive grants-in-aid under Government inspection and examination. As part of the policy of

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

1854, universities were set up at Calcutta, Bombay, and Madras, in the form of examining bodies, not teaching, but conferring degrees on students from various affiliated colleges, as well as those of the Government. Several of the missionary institutions have been able so to develop their teaching as to take an honourable place among the affiliated colleges, and obtain a fair share of degrees and honours for their students.

But while so far the policy of Sir C. Wood's despatch has been carried out, progress has not been made as was expected towards the ideal of superseding Government institutions by independent aided ones. On the contrary, the fourteen Government colleges existing in 1854 had increased in 1876-7 to twenty-nine general and seventeen professional ones, and the number of Government schools is also much larger than it was. It is stated by Mr. Johnston that the tendency of the officials in India, to whom the working of the educational system is entrusted, has naturally been to multiply unduly Government institutions, and thus practically to hinder the working out of the policy of the home Government in the despatch of 1854. He argues that the advantages that Government institutions have in such a community as that of India leads to an unhealthy competition with private schools and colleges, and that the time has come when Government might cease directly educating, at least in the higher branches. As subsidiary arguments, he urges, that the present system is needlessly costly ; that it gives an undue proportion of aid to higher as distinct from lower education ; and that it overstocks the market with applicants for official places, who form, when disappointed, a disaffected and dangerous class. These are all important considerations in their own place, and they seem to be borne out by facts and figures. On the whole, we think Mr. Johnston has made out his general contention—that the Indian Government ought to be urged to take such measures as will lead to the actual accomplishment of what was contemplated in the despatch of 1854, the withdrawal of the State from the direct work of education, so as to confine itself to the function of superintending and aiding independent efforts. How far this could be done at once, and in what departments or by what stages, can, of course, only be decided in detail by those familiar with the facts ; but on the general policy even an outsider may form an opinion, and the people of this country, having a responsibility and a power through Parliament in this matter, ought to form an opinion, and express it in proper time and ways.

But if this is the right policy of the State, does not the history of this work of education in India show what is the duty of those Churches that have been led to take part in it ? The simple narrative of facts shows the baselessness of what is sometimes said by earnest Christians—that now Government is providing so fully for secular education, missionaries should leave it to them, at least in its higher branches, and concentrate their own efforts on directly evangelistic work. That is the very oppo-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

site of what Providence plainly points out. It would simply be to leave the education of India to mere secularism, and to render it impossible for the Government to shake itself free from responsibility for that. No ! if our view of the policy of Government be at all correct, it is the duty of the Churches and Missionary Societies to keep up their colleges in the utmost possible efficiency, that they may take their part in filling up the void that would be left by the withdrawal of the Government colleges, and in seasoning the intellectual life of the community with the salt of Christian truth and life. The Churches, doubtless, ought to do greatly more in direct evangelistic work, but not to leave the other undone ; and in view of the emphatic testimonies in their favour from the highest and most disinterested authorities,* the cavils still sometimes heard against educational missions ought to be as much out of date as the Ptolemaic astronomy. The Churches have not entered on this work without a distinct providential call, or carried it on without manifest tokens of Divine favour and blessing. The simple fact that the Assembly's College at Calcutta, and the United Christian College at Madras are, while Christian and missionary, more popular than the Government colleges beside them, speaks of a great work slowly and silently done, and of the brightest hopes for the future. The spiritual destinies of India, to human view, depend more upon Christian education than upon anything else. But the Churches may secure not only saving in money and men, but many higher ends, by uniting or co-operating in this work, as has been done at Madras. This is an effort worthy of their greatest wisdom and pains, and one to which they are

* A very weighty evidence of this has come to my knowledge while these sheets are passing through the press. A Conference of about 120 missionaries, native ministers, and Christian laymen, representing twenty different Protestant missions and Religious Societies of Europe and America labouring in Southern India and Ceylon, held at Bangalore, 11th to 18th July, 1879, unanimously adopted the following among other resolutions :—

“ This Conference desires to express its full appreciation of the value of high-class Christian education as a missionary agency, and its hope that the friends of Indian missions will sympathise with this equally with other branches of evangelistic work in this country.

“ The native Church in India needs at present, and will still more need in the future, men of superior education to occupy positions of trust and responsibility as pastors, evangelists, and leading members of the community, such as can only be supplied by our high-class Christian institutions.

“ Those missionaries who are engaged in *vernacular work* desire especially to bear testimony to the powerful effect in favour of Christianity which these institutions are exercising throughout the country, and to record their high regard for the *educational work* as a necessary part of the work of the Christian Church in India.

“ This Conference feels bound to place on record its conviction that these two great branches of Christian work are indispensable complements of one another, and would earnestly hope that they will be so regarded by the Christian Church, and that both will meet with continued and hearty support.”

The same large and representative Conference also approved generally of a memorial regarding aided education addressed to the Governor of Madras Presidency, and expressing views similar to those of Mr. Johnston.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

loudly called. Let them leave their intestine feuds, and set themselves with all their heart and soul and strength and mind to the great, but, by God's blessing, not insoluble problem of the Christianisation of the people of India, by the Word of God which liveth and abideth for ever. So shall the blessing come back upon themselves in a power and freshness and life that no mere doctrinal discussions or abstract debates can ever give.

JAS. S. CANDLISH.

THEOLOGIANS OF THE DAY—JOSEPH COOK.

IN the course of a tour in the United States, in the summer of 1866, when I was a professor in Queen's College, Belfast, I paid a visit to the famous Theological Seminary at Andover. The professors told me that there was a young man in their institution anxious to see me, and politely apologised for troubling me with such request. I answered that I spent a large portion of my life in intercourse with young men, and asked them at once to introduce me to him. I found that he was pondering in an intelligent and earnest manner the deepest problems in philosophy, and the living questions of the day; and I left him with the conviction which I expressed to several persons, that with the exception of their great man Dr. Park, I had not met at that graduation season at Andover, where the ablest of the Congregational body do congregate, a more noteworthy man than this stalwart youth. For years I did not hear more of him. I had forgotten his name, and could not inquire about him. It was not till I had been settled for some time in America, that on the then famous lecturer coming into my house in Princeton, I found that this was the very youth, now grown to manhood, I had conversed with on profound subjects in Andover. What influence I may have had on Mr. Cook I do not know, but I am pleased to notice that on intuition and several other subjects, he is promulgating to thousands the same views I had been thinking out in my study, and propounding to my students, in Belfast and in Princeton.

From scattered notices, I gather that he was born (in 1838), and reared and still lives, in his leisure days, in that region in which the loveliest of American lakes, Lake Champlain and Lake George, lie embosomed among magnificent mountains. He was trained for college at Phillips' Academy, Andover, under the great classical teacher Dr. Taylor; was two years at Yale College, and two years at Harvard, graduating at the latter in 1865, first in philosophy and rhetoric of his class. He then joined Andover Theological Seminary, went through the regular three years' course there, and lingered a year longer at that place, pondering deeply the relations of science and religion, which continued to be the theme of his thoughts and his study for the next ten

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

years. At this stage he received much impulse from Professor Park, who requires every student to reason out, and to defend his opinions ; and many sound philosophic principles from Sir William Hamilton and other less eminent men of the Scottish school. He spoke from time to time at religious meetings, and was for one year the pastor of a Congregational Church, but never sought a settlement. In September, 1871, he went abroad, and studied for two years, under special directions from Tholuck, at Halle, Berlin, and Heidelberg ; and received a mighty influence from Julius Müller of Halle, Dorner of Berlin, Kum Fischer of Heidelberg, and Hermann Lotze of Göttingen. He then travelled for a time in Italy, Egypt, Syria, Greece, Turkey, Switzerland, France, England, and Scotland. Returning to the United States in 1873, he took up his residence in Boston, and became a lecturer in New England on the subject to which his studies had been so long directed, the relations of religion and science. For a time he lectured at Amherst College, and while doing so, he was invited to conduct noon meetings in Boston. I mention these incidents to show that Mr. Cook did not take up the work which he has accomplished as a trade, or by accident, or from impulse ; but that for years he had been preparing for it, and prepared for it, by an overruling guidance.

I regard Joseph Cook as a heaven-ordained man. He comes at the fit time—that is, at the time he is needed. He starts in the appropriate place—that is, in New England, where both truth and error are more keenly discussed than in any other part of the United States, or perhaps in any other country in the world. All the people read newspapers, in the cities a daily newspaper ; the more intelligent have a favourite magazine, and they are ready to discuss all popular questions, political and theological. Every town, almost every village, has its course of lectures in the winter ; these are often mere vapid rhetoric, but still they start topics for talk if not for thought.* More important still, he comes forth in Boston, which is undoubtedly the most literary city in America, and one of the great literary cities of the world. I am not sure that even Edinburgh can match it, now that London is drawing towards it and gathering up the intellectual youth of Scotland. It has a character of its own in several respects. I have here to speak only of its religious character. Half-a-century ago its orthodoxy had sunk into Unitarianism—a reaction against a formal Puritanism—led by Channing, who adorned his bald system by his high personal character and the

* I had occasion, not long ago, to address a body of State teachers at a convention in New England. I had seated myself on the platform ready to speak, when a teacher came up to me, and said, "Let us settle the question of free-will and predestination." I told him that we would have to settle this question at a future time ; and, in case we should never meet again on earth, I took him engaged to meet me in heaven, where we would see things in a clearer light. Immediately on this gentleman leaving, another teacher came up, and desired to know what I thought of annihilation being the punishment of the wicked. At this instant the chairman called on me to begin my address, and we lost the opportunity of discussing and deciding the questions.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

eloquence of his style. People could not long be satisfied by a negation, and Parkerism followed ; and a convulsive life was thrown into the skeleton of natural religion by an *a priori* speculation, derived from the pretentious philosophies of Germany, in which the Absolute took the place of God, and untested intuition the place of the Bible. The movement culminated in Ralph Waldo Emerson, a feebler, but a more lovable Thomas Carlyle—the one coming out of a decaying Puritanism, the other out of a decaying Covenanterism. But those who would mount to heaven in a balloon have sooner or later to come down to earth. The young men of Harvard College, led by their able president, have more taste for the new physical science, with its developments, than for a visionary metaphysics. As I remarked some time ago in a literary organ, Unitarianism has died, and is laid out for decent burial. Meanwhile there is a marked revival of Evangelism, and the Congregational and Episcopal churches have as much thoughtfulness and culture as the Unitarians. Harvard now cares as little for Unitarianism as it does for Evangelism—simply taking care that orthodoxy does not rule over its teaching. But the question arises, What are our young men to believe in these days when Darwinism, and Spencerism, and evolutionism are taught in our journals, in our schools, and in our colleges ? To my knowledge this question is as anxiously put by Unitarian parents of the old school, who cling firmly to the great truths of natural religion, and to the Bible as a teacher of morality, as it is by the orthodox.

Such was the state of thought and feeling, of belief and unbelief, of apprehension and of desire, when Joseph Cook came to Boston without any flourish of trumpets preceding him. Numbers were prepared to welcome him as soon as they knew what the man was, and what he was aiming at. Orthodox ministers, not very well able themselves to wrestle with the new forms of infidelity, rejoiced in the appearance of one who had as much power of eloquence as Parker, and vastly more acquaintance with philosophy than the mystic Emerson, and who seemed to know what truth and what error there are in these doctrines of development and heredity. The best of the Unitarians, not knowing whither their sons were drifting, were pleased to find one who could keep them from open infidelity. Young men, tired of old rationalism, which they saw to be very irrational, delighted to listen to one who evidently spoke boldly and sincerely, and could talk to them of these theories about evolution and the origin of species and the nature of man. The consequence was, his audiences increased from year to year. He first lectured in the Meinaon in 1875. The attendance at noon on Mondays was so large that his meetings had to be transferred to Park Street Church on October, 1876 ; and finally, in 1876-7, in 1877-8 and 1879, to the enormous Tremont Temple, which is often crowded to excess. In the audience there were at times 200 ministers, many teachers, and other educated persons. His lectures, in whole or in abstract, appeared in leading newspapers, and his fame spread over all America ; and, continuing his

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

Monday addresses in Boston, he was invited, on the other days of the week, to lecture all over the country. He now lectures in the principal cities, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, receiving from \$150 to \$200 a lecture, and always drawing a large and approving audience. In a number of American cities, especially in the Middle States and in the west, there are little knots of infidels, some of them very noisy, and Joseph Cook is found to be the man to meet them and counteract their influence. Several of the secular, and a few even of the religious newspapers, have ridiculed him, and tried to put him down ; but this has only made him more known, and increased his audience, who find him to be a true and genuine man. Some scientific sciolists have thrown out doubts as to the accuracy of his knowledge, but have not been able to detect him in any misstatement of fact ; and as to his theories, they are at least as good as theirs, and for defence he is able to fall back on Lotze, who holds so high a place in Germany. None of his detractors will be able to put him down, and he has too much good sense and principle to allow himself to be tempted into sensationalism, the rock on which so many American speakers have struck.

Whatever people may say to the contrary, Joseph Cook is an original man. He may have got some of his impulse from Dr. Park, but he follows, certainly he copies, no one. I have to add that no sensible man will make a fool of himself by trying to copy one who has a way of his own. He is a unity throughout—body, soul, and mind all act together to produce the effect. He has none of the small rhetorical mannerism so cultivated in American colleges, and which has kept so much of American eloquence from being natural ; a mannerism which consists of a few formal attitudes supposed to be suited to the subject—as the pointing upward when a mountain is named, and downward when a vale is referred to ; of an intonation derived from the teacher, and the same for the whole class or college ; and a select set of exclamations which impress the hearers with the irresistible conviction that there is no earnestness in the speaker. Professor Cook throws himself entirely into his subject. His bodily frame evidently takes a part, and moves in accordance with his theme. One of his lectures which I have had the pleasure of hearing consists in a dialogue between man and his conscience. We see that the speaker is absorbed in the discussion ; we are constrained to listen, and we become intensely interested as we do so. In others he lightens and thunders, throwing a vivid light on the topic by an expression or comparison, or striking a presumptuous error as by a bolt from heaven. He is not afraid to discuss the most abstract, scientific, or philosophic themes before a popular audience ; he arrests his hearers first by his earnestness, then by the clearness of his exposition, and fixes the whole in the mind by the earnestness of his moral purpose.

The preludes with which Professor Cook introduces his lectures is a happy device, as it relieves a hard subject, and gives him an opportunity

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

of rebuking evils as they spring up, and of guiding public sentiment, much as journalists do. His lectures, however, will be his permanent means of usefulness. I have before me five goodly volumes of these. It is needless to give a summary of works that are so clearly written, and so accessible to all. I close this imperfect article by offering a very few critical remarks on the positions he takes up. I notice the volumes, not in their historical, but rather in their logical order.

I. The volume on TRANSCENDENTALISM. Professor Cook, like Socrates, insists much on definitions and tests of truth, and would thus correct much of the error of the day which arises greatly from ambiguity of language and confusion of thought. He uses Intuition, Instinct, Experiment, and Syllogism as tests of truth. He gives an admirable account of Intuition. I have long been insisting that the tests of intuition are not primarily, as Kant and most metaphysicians maintain, necessity and universality. The primary mark of intuition is self-evidence, and this is followed by necessity and universality. We know that two straight lines cannot enclose a space, not because we are compelled to do so, or because all men do so, or because of forms in the mind; but because we at once perceive it to be so from the nature of straight lines. We are glad to find Mr. Cook following this order. I venture to suggest that he would add to the cogency of his statement if he would announce clearly that a truth is perceived intuitively *by looking at the nature of the things*. He would thus separate himself thoroughly from those *a priori* forms which Kant imposes on phenomena, and which carry us away from realities.

II. The volume on ORTHODOXY. In this volume, as in the preceding, he founds morality on intuition, shows that intuition convicts men of guilt, and demonstrates very satisfactorily the need of an atonement. He proves from the intimations of our nature that God must condemn and punish sin, and corrects the common misapprehensions of the nature of the atonement, showing that it does not imply that Jesus Christ is reckoned as guilty, but merely that he suffers in our room and stead. In the volume before us he thoroughly exposes the theology of Theodore Parker. Before the attack of Mr. Cook, Mr. Parker's influence was waning, now it is thoroughly gone. I believe we shall soon be able to say the same of Mr. Emerson, who, however, is always treated lovingly by our lecturer, and whose poetry in prose will live long after his mystic opinions—if they can in their undefined form be called opinions—have ceased to sway the thoughts of men, young or old.

III. The volume on BIOLOGY. Here he has the wisdom to oppose, not evolution—which is a truth both of nature and revelation—but materialistic evolution. He takes advantage of the concessions of evolutionists, and exposes their inconsistencies with considerable dexterity; and shows conclusively that they are not warranted in deriving life from inanimate matter, or the soul from body. I am not sure, however, whether he has not imposed too rigid a limit upon the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

potency of matter. It is true that all matter has inertia, that it cannot move of itself, while the oldest definition of the mind is, that it is self-moving. But surely matter has some powers or properties. I have been labouring in my published works to show that while matter is so far passive, that it does not act of itself; it is also so far active that matter acts on matter, molecule on molecule, and mass on mass. All that is required of the spiritualists is to show that the properties of mind, such as thought and volition, are entirely different from those of matter, such as extension and resistance.

As to life, I think it wiser in the present state of science not to dogmatise as to its nature. No definition has yet been given of it fitted to stand a sifting examination. It is certain that all attempts to produce a living being from inanimate matter have failed. But it has not been scientifically settled whether life is a separate principle or the product of a wondrous adjustment of chemical and mechanical forces. I do not believe that religion has much interest in the settlement of this question one way or other. I am inclined to say much the same of spontaneous generation; even if it were established, religion would not thereby be undermined; for there might be numerous adaptations implying design in the concurrence of causes producing life.

I feel constrained to state that, while Lotze is a great name both in philosophy and in physiology, I am not inclined to set so great value on his special theories as our lecturer does. Some of them have been reviewed by competent critics, and have not been verified by the latest science. I have to add, that I set no value on the theory which Mr. Cook states—though I am not sure that he adopts it—about there being some non-atomic enshwathment of the soul. I rather think that he has not benefited his argument by introducing it and attaching such importance to it.

IV. The volume on HEREDITY. Our lecturer has given a very good summary of what has been ascertained on this subject. He has an acute criticism of the theory of pangenesis, which Darwin introduces to bolster up his system where he felt it to be weak. What is the new pangenesis but the old life? The mystery of heredity has not yet been cleared up. All that we know is that there are certain empirical laws, which, in the end, will have to be resolved into higher laws. Meanwhile, we are greatly indebted to Professor Cook for restraining sciolists from turning the little that is known to an improper use. In his lectures, both on biology and heredity, he shows his good sense in falling back on the accurate researches and judicious statements of Professor Beale.

V. His lecture on CONSCIENCE is a very valuable one. It contains much sound argument, but it by no means exhausts the subject or meets all the objections started in the present day. Our higher moralists, following Butler, have for the last century and a-half been appealing to conscience as a simple and unresolvable power with unquestionable authority from which there can be no appeal. In opposition, attempts

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

have been made since the days of Hume to account for the genesis of conscience by the association of ideas. These have now been abandoned. I have taken my share in the discussions which have led to this result. The attempt now is to account for our moral ideas by heredity. This is the grand speculative question in ethics—indeed, in philosophy generally—at this present moment. Herbert Spencer has taken it up, and is constructing a theory which those who defend the old morality must proceed to take up. I trust that Professor Cook will be spared to take part in this conflict, involving, as it does, most momentous consequences, both speculative and practical.

JAMES MCOSH.

THE LATE LORD LAWRENCE, VICEROY OF INDIA.

WHEN suddenly, and to the sorrow of the whole Empire, the chilly damp of the past summer struck down the British Peer who was best known as John Lawrence of the Punjab, two men gave voice to the opinion of his country on his career. The Anglican dignitary who had invited the family to lay the honoured remains in Westminster Abbey, declared, as he stood near the grave's mouth, that the Joshua of his country had fallen—"the great Proconsul of our English Christian Empire," who had saved "the India of Clive, of Hastings, and the illustrious statesman Bentinck, the civilisation which is sanctified by the missionary zeal of Martyn, of Duff, and Wilson, by the enlightened wisdom of prelates like Heber and Cotton." And the Nonconformist statesman, Mr. Forster, told the people of the manufacturing and labouring districts, that one of England's greatest men, throughout her history, had passed away. "When our children's children, and the men of our race all the world over, in future times, shall read the wonderful story of our rule in India, there is no man to whose career they will look back with more justifiable pride than to that of Lord Lawrence. . . . You only know of him by repute; it has been my privilege to have had his personal friendship for the last few years."

It has been mine to have watched every step of his progress, since he made the Punjab what it became when he used it to save the whole of India from anarchy and barbarism. It was mine to publicly chronicle and criticise every act of John Lawrence from the day that he took Delhi to the time when we Anglo-Indians welcomed him back as Viceroy and Governor-General, and again speeded him home after five years in the highest office a British subject can fill, next to the Premier's. And since he exchanged the cares of empire for the duties of the philanthropist and the peer in London—coming occasionally to Edinburgh, where, indeed, he discharged almost his last official act—I had learned to know

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

him as a man, even better than as one of the two greatest soldier-statesmen ever sent by our country to the East, his brother Henry being the other. It is fitting that, in these pages, a sketch of what John Lawrence did, and of what he was, should reveal somewhat prominently what all other contemporary biographies and estimates of him have strangely omitted,—his views upon, his services to, Christian Missions. Beside the organisation of the Punjab Government and the capture of Delhi, we must place a third though forgotten achievement—the minute of the 21st April, 1858, in which he reviewed the principles of our government of India in the light of Christian duty. For John Lawrence is the Cromwell of the history of our Indian Empire. It is significant that Ward selected his true face and righteous bearing as the model, in the famous fresco, for the Baron who is represented as securing our liberties at Runnymede. But the first Baron Lawrence was more than that, even as Cromwell himself was more. He was a Puritan as well as a soldier-statesman, whom the fire of conflict and of victory had purged into the gentleness and the charity of a saint as he approached within two years of the allotted threescore-and-ten.

John Mair Laird was the eighth, as his equally famous brother Henry was the fifth, of the twelve sons and daughters born, in many parts of the world, to the stout old soldier, Colonel Alexander Lawrence. John's birth-place, on the 24th March, 1811, happened to be Richmond, in Yorkshire. But he was Scottish by origin, and Irish by immediate parentage, thus illustrating in his own person, as Mr. Forster was not slow to observe, Irish boldness, Scottish caution, and English endurance. But underlying all three, in both Henry and John, was the Scottish faith which they learned at their mother's knee. She was a Knox, descendant of the Reformer's great-nephew, that Andrew Knox, Bishop of the Isles, who was translated to Raphoe. Through her and her sons, as through much that is best in the Irish Church, there ran the Presbyterian strain; while that and the Episcopal associations by which they came to be surrounded gave to both the evangelical catholicity which marked the officers of the Punjab school, and all of the Indian services who stand out boldly for Christ. From his earliest years John determined to be a soldier, and his eagerness for Addiscombe was inflamed when Henry returned home ill as a Lieutenant of Bengal Artillery. But the big family could not afford to dispense with the better-paid appointments of the Civil Service, and John was forced to content himself with the "writership" presented to him by Mr. John Huddleston, who, when in Madras, had been the friend of Schwartz. For this, his uncle's college at Derry, and succeeding schools at Bristol and elsewhere, were not a very good preparation; but John passed through Haileybury with more than the average reputation of his fellows. Long after, in the height of his fame, he said to Sir Herbert Edwardes, his most trusted assistant, "Henry and I were both bad in languages, and always continued so, and were not good in anything which required a technical memory; but

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1870.]

we were good in anything which required thought and judgment. We were good, for instance, in history." And so they became great in making history.

The same providence which nursed the soldier-spirit in Henry while directing it into the statesman's career, was evident also from the hour when John landed in India. For years after they did not meet, but it is curious to reflect that while, in 1830, the young civilian was completing his mastery of Persian and Hindoo in Calcutta, the first missionary of the Church of Scotland, Alexander Duff, five years his senior, was, almost in the next street, laying the foundation of his great Christianising agency. Duff kept to Bengal, to the English capital; Lawrence had no sooner passed his examinations than he begged to be sent to Delhi. There, amid the then turbulent half-million of Mohammedan swash-bucklers and armed Hindu cultivators, he began and carried on for years that study of the martial classes and the sweating millions of Upper India, which made him at once their master and their hero when the time of trial came. Let this unpublished anecdote of him suffice. When he had risen to be Collector, or terrestrial providence to the half-million, a lawless chief in the desert-tract of the country refused to pay his land-tax. Attended only by his orderly, "Jan Larrens" rode out from Delhi for many miles in the early morning. He found the walled village closed to him, and himself defied. There were no troops within thirty miles. It was the fierce time of tropical May, and no shelter was visible, save a meagre babool tree. Was he to ride back *re infecta*, trailing with him the prestige of his Government, and so inviting all the country to go and do likewise? He retired to the scanty shade of the tree, pencilled a note to an officer in Delhi ordering out a battery, and took up his position in sight of the principal gateway. High rose the sun, more thirsty and wearied became the Collector, but he must take the village, even as he was long after to take Delhi. Still no troops appeared. As he scanned the horizon for them, he observed a solitary native approaching. "Saheb," said the Oriental, "why do you sit there? If you wish to humble these traitors to their salt, I will help you before the guns come." The speaker was the chief of a neighbouring fort, who had no objection to take this opportunity of at once avenging his private wrongs, and gaining the favour of the dread Collector. The result was the submission of the recusant village, the payment of the land-tax with a fine superadded, and the return of the resolute civilian to Delhi. Years passed on, the Mutiny came and ceased, and when "Jan Larrens" was the Lieutenant-Governor of the whole Punjab, a list of the names of rebels sentenced to death was put before him for his signature. The first name caught his attention, he remembered it was that of the Goojur who had assisted him on the burning May day, and he spared his life.

For the twenty years ending 1849, John Lawrence thus worked among and over the people of the country from the Jumna to the Sutlej.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

He learned from masters like Mertins Bird and Thomason, what those who are responsible for Egypt and Turkey are slow to understand, that the secret of the prosperity of an Asiatic population lies in the equitable settlement of the land revenue, and in the adequate protection of life and property. Hindostan was then only a bigger Ulster or Ireland. A born democrat, when he saw the sensuality, the self-seeking, the oppression of which the Hindu and Mohammedan nobles were guilty, he learned to sympathise with the cultivators, to love the people, to oppose the aristocratic policy to which his brother Henry and Lord Canning afterwards lent all their influence from the purest motives. Hence, he was a man after our own Marquis of Dalhousie's heart. But, like many others, he might have worked on in routine obscurity, had not Dalhousie's predecessor, Lord Hardinge, discovered both him and his brother Henry. While Henry helped that Commander-in-Chief and Governor-General to win the first Sikh war and organise the transition administration, it was John who made even military success possible, by collecting all the carriage and supplies for the army. After Ferozeshuhur our troops could not have fought, had not a personal appeal from the Governor-General to the Collector of Delhi led John Lawrence, who had returned from his first furlough home, to do more than was required by seeing that the natives were properly paid. Thus was John Lawrence one of the victors at Sobraon, which ended in our occupation of Lahore. Hence, Lord Hardinge told the House of Commons Committee, he made the young Collector ruler of the territory across the Sutlej. There it was in the Jullundhur Doab that that triumph of the government of a conquered people by a Christian statesman really began—the administration of the fifteen millions of Sikhs and Mohammedans, Hindu soldiers and Afghan robbers, in the Punjab.

When the second Sikh war sent the Maharaja Dhuleep Singh, as a Christian, to England, it made John Lawrence ruler of the land of the five rivers, from near Delhi to Peshawur and Beloochistan. At first Lord Dalhousie united him with his brother Henry and his old school-fellow, the present Sir Robert Montgomery, in a Board. But the brothers were of opposing sympathies, and the puzzled Governor-General had to decide that John's financial vigilance and official sternness could alone weld the anarchical elements of Runjeet Singh's kingdom into a prosperous province. So Henry, the better beloved, but in this case not the abler of the two, had to go with a broken heart, to become in his time himself provisional Viceroy, should Lord Canning have succumbed in 1857. It is a touching story, that episode in the career of the two brothers, who never ceased to love each other—partly told in the Life of Henry, but not to be fully revealed till his brother's papers see the light. May that be soon! By both was the famous Punjab School formed; created first by the fascination of Henry's loving nature, then consolidated into a unity and directed to the highest end entrusted to Great Britain in the world, by John's practical energy and stern

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

policy. The people were made happy, peaceful, prosperous ; and yet the Punjab was made to pay, while the chiefs—else sensual, extravagant, and politically dangerous—were taught to respect the iron hand in the glove of silk. For the eight years, as Chief Commissioner, up to 1857, John Lawrence thus unconsciously educated chiefs and people, army and officials alike, for the hour of terrible trial which, for them all, came at Meerut, when English and faithful Hindu blood ran down its artillery lines.

What will ever be famous in Indian history as the Punjab School, consisted at first of fifty-six choice officers, half of them civilians and half military men, whom love to Henry first inspired, and reverence for John then built up into the most perfect, that is, most righteous and successful government Asia has ever seen, since the theocracy under Joshua. Beside the two brothers, let us reverently place, first of all, the dead to whom they have gone over—John Nicholson, Sir Donald M'Leod, Sir Herbert Edwardes, General Lake, General Macpherson, and others. Of those still spared to their country there, besides Abbotts and Bechers and Lumsdens and Egertons, Sir Robert Montgomery and Sir R. Temple. All that Punjab School found the zealous discharge of their secular duty compatible with, and aided by the frank profession of the Christian faith. Most of them were active soldiers of Jesus Christ, who, in their private position, propagated His teaching through the English, Scottish, and American missionaries of all Churches, with a humble faith that is still producing the most blessed fruit when they have gone.

The Mutiny tried in the fire the work which John Lawrence had done, aided by such subordinates, and found little wood, hay, or stubble in the fabric to be consumed. In Calcutta, it came upon Lord Canning when surrounded by bad or weak advisers. At the head of the armies of India was a silken Commander-in-Chief, General Anson, whose inexperienced movements were soon forgotten in his death, though their consequences continued to bear bitter fruit. Over half India, from Allahabad to Peshawur, the Mutiny made John Lawrence the uncontrolled ruler. The whole British Empire looked to him to trample down insurrection, to beat back sepoy devastation—and it did not look in vain. He would never have allowed Delhi to fall into the rebels' hands. But the Commander-in-Chief having done that, it was his task to capture it again. It was said—said in the House of Lords, by Lord Granville, in his eagerness to apologise for Lord Canning's early inactivity—that Lawrence had recommended the Governor-General to treat with the rebels. Again, the miserable councillors around Lord Canning further sought to shield their own impotence by asserting that "Iron John," as he used to be called, was ready to abandon the Peshawur valley ! Sir John Kaye has done this subject so little justice, that I here state the actual facts, which I ascertained soon after the events, from the very highest authority on such calumnious charges.

In the first week of July, when our position was gloomiest, the King of Delhi proposed to turn traitor, and promised the General besieging

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

the city to admit the British troops into the palace if he were forgiven. Such a service might atone for treason, but it could not wipe out the stain of murder, and the reply was returned, that the offer would be worthy of consideration if the King were innocent of the murder of Christians. In command of the palace-citadel, we would have crushed the mutineers who afterwards escaped to feed the rebellion in Oudh, and the campaign might have ended a year sooner than it did and at one tithe of the expense of blood and treasure. So in the case of Peshawur. When Delhi still defied us, when the last man had been sent to the Ridge, when Mussulmans and Sikhs alike began to doubt our power to recover our position, and Sir John Lawrence began to make arrangements with friendly chiefs for the protection of wives and children, then surely came the question, What is to be done if Delhi stands? In that event, Sir John Lawrence was *prepared* to give up Peshawur before the end came, that he might utilise its garrison for the safety of the English in the province. The question was one of the possible end of the British Empire in the East, and before that came Peshawur must go.

On the other hand, what did the Chief Commissioner do? what would he have done had Anson been under his orders? Finding that Montgomery, Corbett, and Macpherson had proved themselves equal to the strain at Lahore, he placed himself at Rawul Pindie, in the most central position between the frontier and the capital. Except the disarming of sepoyes when he was in the hills at Murree, all the policy was his. We find Sir R. Montgomery, in the Mutiny Report, expressing on the part of "every officer in the Province," "sincerest admiration of the intrepid policy he *originated* and so nobly carried out—even to complete success." His first act had been to urge General Anson to make an immediate advance on Delhi, at a time when every officer consulted by his Excellency was adverse to that course. Had Anson been a soldier Delhi would have fallen a week after it declared for rebellion, and long before its scanty sepoy garrison had been reinforced by the crowds of mutineers whom the rebel flag induced to desert. To John Lawrence, and to him alone, is due even its long-delayed fall. Just, too, as Lord Canning to the last was advised not to disarm the troops at Dinapore, which delayed the march of all British reinforcements, and led to the massacre of Cawnpore, General Anson would not disarm the Umballa sepoyes, although pressed to do so by the Chief Commissioner. The result he tells us in the despatch of 25th May, 1858, which reviews the events of the Mutiny, "the advance of our troops towards Delhi, and the victory at Badlee Serai near that city on the 8th June, which proved to the country that there was vitality in our cause and power on our side." "Thus it was that, through mistaken leniency and blind confidence in native soldiers, an opportunity was missed, whereby, at the outset of the disturbances, a whole brigade might have been successfully dealt with in a vigorous and exemplary manner." How the 4th Light Cavalry, the 5th N. I., and the 60th N. I., the soldiers referred to,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

deserted or mutinied, fired on their officers at Rohituk, and swelled finally the Delhi garrison, history tells. Living through these events, and studying them now as recorded in cold blood, I have failed to find one flaw in the action or the policy of John Lawrence in these days, and at the very darkest hour England showed its appreciation by sending him the Grand Cross of the Bath.

When the triumph came, how did he bear it? The despatch thus concludes, "In causing this narrative to be recorded, Sir John Lawrence has not been actuated by any motive of self-laudation. Throughout the crisis he could not but feel that human means and human precautions were utterly impotent, that everything which was done, or could be done to surmount such dangers and difficulties was as nothing, and that trust could be placed in Divine Providence alone. . . . His mercy vouchsafed a happy issue to our measures, and confounded the devices of our enemies. Human aid could avail us nothing in that crisis, and it is owing to an overruling Providence, and that alone, that a single Englishman was left alive in the Punjab." I have reason to believe that this passage expresses more than the public, or historical, or providential conviction of the writer as to God's working. There he speaks of his country, his Government, his administration. But the Mutiny crisis and deliverance brought, if not a new, certainly a vitally intensified spiritual experience to himself. I remember well a conversation with him, when he was Governor-General, at Peterhof, Simla, in September, 1866, when he reverently alluded to his solitary musings at the darkest time, having arranged for the protection of his wife and family by a faithful chief if the worst should come. Few could pass through that fire untouched, and he came out of the hottest of the furnace, like many men and women in humbler life, seven times refined.

Hence the most famous of all his Minutes, to which I now come, that of 21st April, 1858. Sir H. Edwardes had officially sent him a somewhat extreme memorandum on "the elimination of all unchristian principle from the Government of India." Sir Donald McLeod passed on the communication with a letter which Sir John pronounced "more moderate in its tone and marked by an enlightened and excellent spirit." Lawrence was willing to teach the Bible in State schools, and in voluntary classes wherever there were Christian teachers, "in order that our views of Christian duty might be patent to the native public." Edwardes would have resumed idol endowments, Lawrence declared that "the judgments of Providence would become manifest in the political disaffection which might ensue," and such a step would retard the progress of Christianity while it is condemned by the whole tenor of its teachings. On the subject of caste Sir John pointed out that Government had not recognised it except in the sepoy army, urged the raising of sweeper regiments as he himself had done, and of corps from the non-Aryan tribes, and anticipated the "happy time" when regiments of Native Christians could be raised. But while encouraging sepoys to consult

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

missionaries, he condemned preaching to the native soldiers in a body, unless they were of the aboriginal tribes destitute of a faith. He refused to disallow native holidays; earnestly desired to see the law altered in reference to polygamy and early betrothals; would prohibit religious processions in public as he did in the case of the Mohurrum at Delhi, and would interdict obscenities in temples; would restrict prostitutes to their houses; would increase the number of married soldiers and improve the condition of their wives and widows; condemned the opium monopoly, accepting the existing system; but did not agree as to the evil tendency of the liquor excise in the Punjab, where it has diminished the drunkenness encouraged in the Sikh *régime*. And the despatch concludes with a passage which is worthy of being made the key-note of our policy in India, as it was of his own administration:—

“Sir J. Lawrence has been led, in common with others since the occurrence of the awful events of 1857, to ponder deeply on what may be the faults and shortcomings of the British as a Christian nation in India. In considering topics such as those treated of in this despatch, he would solely endeavour to ascertain what is our Christian duty. Having ascertained that according to our erring lights and conscience, he would follow it out to the uttermost, undeterred by any consideration. If we address ourselves to this task, it may, with the blessing of Providence, not prove too difficult for us. Measures have, indeed, been proposed as essential to be adopted by a Christian Government which would be truly difficult or impossible of execution. But on closer consideration it will be found that such measures are not enjoined by Christianity, but are contrary to its spirit. Sir John Lawrence does entertain the earnest belief that all those measures which are really and truly Christian can be carried out in India, not only without danger to British rule, but on the contrary, with every advantage to its stability. Christian things done in a Christian way will never, the Chief Commissioner is convinced, alienate the heathen. About such things there are qualities which do not provoke nor excite distrust, nor harden to resistance. It is when unchristian things are done in the name of Christianity, or when Christian things are done in an unchristian way, that mischief and danger are occasioned. The difficulty is, amid the political complications, the conflicting social considerations, the fears and hopes of self-interest which are so apt to mislead human judgment, to discern clearly what is imposed upon us by Christian duty and what is not. Having discerned this, we have but to put it into practice. Sir John Lawrence is satisfied that, within the territories committed to his charge, he can carry out all those measures which are really matters of Christian duty on the part of the Government. And, further, he believes that such measures will arouse no danger; will conciliate instead of provoking, and will subserve to the ultimate diffusion of the truth among the people.

“Finally, the Chief Commissioner would recommend, that such measures and policy, having been deliberately determined on by the Supreme Government, be openly avowed and universally acted upon throughout the empire; so that there may be no diversities of practice, no isolated tentative, or conflicting efforts, which are, indeed, the surest means of exciting distrust; so that the people may see that we have no sudden or sinister designs; and so that we may exhibit that harmony and uniformity of conduct which befits a Christian nation striving to do its duty.”

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1870.]

The triumphant statesman and soldier who wrote thus was made only a Baronet by the Crown on his retirement from India. But the expiring East India Company voted him a life-pension of £2000 a-year. When the resignation and death of Lord Elgin, in the midst of the Umbayla frontier war, alarmed the Government, it a second time departed from all precedent since the days of Warren Hastings and Shore, by sending the civilian, John Lawrence, back as the Viceroy in 1864. Lord Palmerston was the Cabinet Minister who had refused to increase slightly the pension of the father, but was forced by critical times to nominate first the son Henry, and then John, Governor-General. "Iron John" could not be greater than on the day he took Delhi, while he wept that Nicholson had fallen. But in the higher office he maintained his reputation, and on his return home in 1869 was created first Baron Lawrence. I saw him stand at his brother's tomb in the Lucknow Residency, just after all the chivalry of Oudh had done him homage, and although I remembered how the younger brother had been put in the place of the elder in Lahore, I did not marvel that the newly-made Peer lovingly chose Henry's arms and crest as his own. On the right stands an officer of the famous Guide Irregulars, a Pathan of Peshawur; on the left is an officer of the Sikh Irregular Cavalry. The motto of Baron Lawrence of the Punjab is, "Be Ready," as his brother's was, "Never Give In." We think of both as we muse in the nave of the Abbey where lie together Outram, Colin Campbell, and Livingstone, but no hero greater as man or Christian than John Lawrence.

GEORGE SMITH.

RISE AND PROGRESS OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN CANADA.

PRESBYTERIANISM in Canada can barely count a hundred years of history. It was weak at the start—the population at the date of the conquest being chiefly French and Roman Catholic; but it kept pace with the growth of the English-speaking nationalities in the country—a little behind, it is true, with characteristic caution, to make sure of the permanency of settlements, while the Methodists led the van. From the first it had in its elements that made for catholicity. The same may be said, indeed, of the country in its social and civil aspect. There has been such a commingling of races to form the population of the Dominion as ought to satisfy the stoutest champions of miscegenation, securing a vigorous, many-sided nation.

The doctrines of the Westminster Confession, with Presbyterian government, were introduced into what is now the Dominion from several quarters and under a variety of auspices. The Church of Scotland was before all others in planting the "blue banner" in the province of Lower

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

Canada, now Quebec, and in the eastern section of Upper Canada, now Ontario. The first Presbyterian preacher of whom we have any record in Nova Scotia came from the United States, and was a licentiate of a Presbytery in that country, which was then British territory. It was the Burgher Synod of Scotland, however, which was really the first to occupy that field to purpose, being followed a few years afterwards by their near of kin, the Antiburghers. A Presbytery in New York State was moved almost simultaneously to send representatives to the Niagara peninsula; while the Dutch Reformed Church of the United States went in and possessed in Christ's name the districts adjacent to Kingston and Brockville. At a later period, the Associate and Burgher Synods of Scotland took an active part in the evangelisation of Upper Canada, which they continued to do still more vigorously after they together formed in the mother-country the United Secession Church. The Church of Scotland was earliest in New Brunswick, and its adherents continued relatively to be the most numerous. It will thus be seen that the Presbyterianism of the Dominion in its infancy drew to itself material strength and sustenance, as well as inspiration, from a considerable number of sources, and each of these has left its mark more or less deeply impressed upon the character which our Church bears to-day.

It was, of course, to be expected that the various home Churches would follow their children who emigrated to Canada with watchful eyes and sympathising hearts, and would do all in their power to alleviate the hardships of life in the bush by means of the genial influences of religion. But that the American Presbyterian Church should have been the first to set up our standard in the western part of the British possessions ought to call forth admiration and gratitude, if not surprise. The keen political feeling excited by the revolutionary war had not yet subsided, when preachers from "across the line" were found penetrating the Canadian forests in search of the new settlements, holding forth the Word of Life, showing that in Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Greek, that the Church is a more comprehensive institution than the State, and that it overleaps boundaries, whether natural or artificial. Indeed, a great many of the early members as well as ministers of the Presbyterian Churches in Canada came into the country by way of the United States. Apart from the fact that New England traders were drawn to the rising towns of the provinces—for commerce, like religion, does not stand on forms of government—a large emigration from the United States took place when their independence was acknowledged and peace was concluded. Many of the colonists who had sympathised strongly with the mother-country in the contest, and who wished ever to live under the British flag, resolved to leave behind the homes they had already established for themselves in the older settlements farther south, and incur afresh the hardships incidental to pioneer life in the backwoods, rather than be separated politically from the Old Land they loved so well. They were of course welcomed to Canada, where thousands of miles of unbroken

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

forest were awaiting the axe of the settler. They naturally pitched their tents on the unoccupied lands along the frontier lakes and rivers, and they were not inappropriately named "United Empire Loyalists." A considerable number of Presbyterians was among them, who had either themselves come from Scotland and Ireland, or were the descendants of emigrants from those countries. This need not excite surprise, for although government by Presbytery may have seemed hateful to the Stuart dynasty, as savouring too much of democracy, yet, as a matter of fact, it is always on the side of order and good government, and it should never be forgotten that it saved Monarchy in Great Britain at a critical juncture in the nation's history.

The first considerable immigration into Canada from the British Isles was of Scottish Highlanders. As early as 1777 a small colony of Celts arrived in Pictou, Nova Scotia, joining there some settlers who before the American Revolution had moved northwards from Pennsylvania and Maryland. They were soon afterwards reinforced by a Highland host from Ross-shire and Sutherlandshire. In 1787, another extensive movement of Gaels took place, but this time their destination was Glengary, Upper Canada. Again, in 1796, a colony from Glenelg settled upon lands in the northern part of the same country. Cape Breton Island, for the continued possession of which, as the key to the southern entrance of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the French so bravely contended, received a large emigration from the Western Highlands in the year 1800. A proportion of these Highlanders was Roman Catholic, but the greater part was Protestant, and to this day they constitute an enthusiastic and powerful element in the Presbyterian Church in Canada. There was also a small colony of good and true men from near Londonderry, Ireland, planted in the neighbourhood of Truro, Nova Scotia. At the close of the American War, a great many disbanded soldiers took up residence in the several settlements then formed in the Provinces, and they, with the Highlanders and U. E. Loyalists, constituted at the end of last century the entire rural population, except in Lower Canada, which, as has been already said, was occupied by the French who chose to remain after the conquest. It was out of these somewhat heterogeneous materials that the first Presbyterian congregations in Canada were formed.

But the chief points at which it was important that the interests of our faith should be looked after were the towns—Halifax, Quebec, Montreal, and Niagara, the latter being then the capital of Upper Canada. Here were the headquarters of the civil and military authorities, as well as of the traders. Accordingly, congregations were organised in these several places. That at Quebec enjoys the distinction of having been first formed. The Rev. George Henry, who had been a military chaplain with the British troops at the siege of the city, began to hold regular services in 1765. The first congregation at Halifax was composed largely of Congregationalists from New England, and was known as the "Protestant Dissenting Congregation," by way of distinction

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1870.]

from the Anglican Church. It was called Mather's Church, in honour of the celebrated Boston minister of that name in the previous century. It was not till 1790 that it became distinctively Presbyterian under the name of St. Matthew's Church.

The next point in order occupied by the pioneers of Presbytery in Canada was Montreal, the headquarters of the fur trade, where Rev. John Bethune, who had previously held the office of chaplain in the 84th Regiment, opened services in 1786. Prosecuting his work there for little more than a year, he in 1787 settled among his Highland fellow-countrymen in Glengary, and was therefore the first to hold up our standard in what is now the Province of Ontario, the stronghold of Presbyterianism in the Dominion. Regular services were not again held for the benefit of the adherents of our Church in Montreal until the advent of Rev. John Young, a licentiate of the Presbytery of Irvine, who came into Canada *via* the Church in the United States in the year 1791, and continued in office till 1802. The first church edifice erected in Old Canada, the St. Gabriel Church, Montreal, still stands, and affords ordinances to the residents of the central part of the city. A Presbyterian congregation was organised in Niagara in 1796, and two years afterwards a church was built.

Reference has already been made to Rev. James Lyon, who came to Nova Scotia from Pennsylvania in the autumn of 1764 or the spring of 1765, the first Presbyterian preacher known to have proclaimed the Gospel in the Maritime Provinces; but he had no settled charge. He was succeeded by Messrs. Cock and Smith at Truro and Londonderry respectively. But the names that are specially associated with the early progress of Presbyterianism in the northern part of Nova Scotia are those of Dr. James M'Gregor of the Antiburgher Church of Scotland, who arrived in 1786, and of Dr. Thomas M'Culloch, who landed seventeen years later. They, with the instincts of their country and faith, foresaw the importance of imparting a liberal education to the people, and therefore made it their first concern to establish schools in the settlements. To crown their labours in this direction, they founded the Pictou Academy, a high school that has done more perhaps to foster a taste for learning than any institution of a similar grade in the Dominion. In this way, and by their activity as ministers of the Word, they caused the roots of Presbyterianism to take deep hold of the soil of Nova Scotia.

The Reformed Dutch Church confined its operations entirely to the central part of Upper Canada. The first minister connected with that body that settled permanently in our country was Rev. Robert M'Dowall, who, in connection with the *Classis* of Albany, organised congregations in Ernestown and Fredericksburgh on the Bay of Quinte, near Kingston, in the year 1798. It was under its auspices, too, that the earliest Presbyterian organisation in Toronto took place, at the beginning of the present century. In this case, the little one has truly become a thou-

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

sand, for "the Queen City of the West" has now a larger Presbyterian population than any other in the Dominion. To sum up: the only positions occupied by our Church at the end of the eighteenth century were the towns of Halifax, Quebec, Montreal, and Niagara, with the rural districts of Pictou and Colchester in Nova Scotia, and Glengary, the Bay of Quinte, and the peninsula of Niagara in Upper Canada.

The growth of the Church during the first quarter of the present century was not rapid; but it kept pace with the progress of the country in other respects in the same period, which was slow. The continental war absorbed the surplus population of the British Isles, and opened avenues of employment and distinction to the hardy and adventurous spirits that have been usually disposed to emigrate to the colonies. The prostration of trade in the mother-country, owing to the burden of the long and gigantic war, led to so much distress that a good many operatives from the manufacturing centres turned their eyes towards the setting sun. Then, after the decisive victory at Waterloo and the pacification of Europe which followed, many veterans of the British army had lands assigned them in Canada, on condition of occupation. In this way Eastern and Central Ontario began to be pretty well taken up by the year 1825. What contributed to the early settlement of this particular section, where the land on the whole is inferior to that farther west, was the construction of the Rideau Canal, an imperial undertaking of great magnitude, which had for its object the connecting of Lake Ontario with the Lower St. Lawrence, by way of the Ottawa River. This project was deemed of great importance, from a military point of view, as affording communication between the different Provinces, at a safe distance from the United States frontier. Many of the officials connected with this immense public work afterwards took up lands, and made their homes in the district through which the canal runs.

The organisation of congregations and the calling of ministers, at this stage in the history of our country and Church, were regulated by no well-defined principles. There was no activity on the part of the parent Churches in the matter of sending missionaries to Canada. Occasionally preachers, claiming to belong to the Presbyterian Churches of the Old World, turned up, neither sent by those Churches, nor sent for by congregations; and the people had such a longing for the services of God's house, as they had enjoyed them in their native land in former days, that they readily welcomed any one coming to them in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, without inquiring very narrowly into the question of credentials. It need not be matter of surprise that their ready confidence was not seldom sadly betrayed—these non-commissioned ministers very often proving unprincipled adventurers, who had lost caste at home. As a rule, the demand had to go to Scotland or Ireland for clergymen before the supply came. And at this period it was not the supreme courts of the Churches at home that took action in the way of designating fit men for the colonies, but some prominent professor or ecclesiastic with whom

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1870.]

leading persons in the communities seeking ministers happened to have an acquaintance. On more than one occasion Dr. Chalmers, for instance, was applied to, to recommend suitable candidates for vacancies on this side the water. The ecclesiastical connection of the clergyman sent for was usually determined by the former connections of those sending for him. But sometimes one or two influential men in the colony succeeded in guiding the choice of their co-religionists, and so it occasionally happened that ministers, trained in the Established Church of Scotland, found themselves called to labour in Canada among Presbyterians who at home had belonged to the Secession Church, and *vice versa*. The people were too glad to have old-country clergymen among them to stickle long over the question of their Scottish connection, and united in calling the best men they could obtain, irrespective of their own Old World predilections. It sometimes happened that probationers of the Established Church could not be had, although a preference for them might have been expressed in the commission sent from Canada; and then not unfrequently preachers belonging to the Burgher, the Antiburgher, or the Relief Church, readily responded to the invitation to come to the colonies, their expectations of a career at home not being perhaps so high as those of the young preachers of the Establishment. The leading towns generally secured ministers of the Church of Scotland. For instance, Dr. Brown of Halifax was succeeded by Dr. Gray, who ministered in St. Matthew's from 1804 to 1826. Rev. John Martin, who was called to St. Andrew's Church, Halifax, also belonged to the Church of Scotland. So did Dr. Spark, who filled St. Andrew's Church, Quebec, till 1819, as well as his successor, Dr. Harkness. Rev. John Barclay, first minister of St. Andrew's Church, Kingston, was a licentiate of the Established Church; as was also Dr. George Burns, late of the Free Church, Corstorphine, who was inducted into St. Andrew's Church, St. John, New Brunswick, in 1817. Besides these, Rev. Donald Allan Fraser came to Pictou, Nova Scotia, in 1816; Rev. John M'Kenzie was settled in Williamstown, Glengary, in 1818; Rev. Alexander Ross in Woolwich, Upper Canada, in 1823; Rev. John M'Lennan in Prince Edward Island in 1823; and Rev. Donald M'Donald in Cape Breton the following year—these all belonged to the Church of Scotland. On the other hand, Rev. James Somerville, who was ordained minister of St. Gabriel Street Church, Montreal, in 1803, was a licentiate of the Relief Church, although his colleagues and successors—Mr. Esson, inducted in 1817, and Mr. Black in 1822—both belonged to the Church of Scotland. So, also, Burns of Niagara, Smart of Brockville, Bell of Perth, Henderson of St. Andrews, Boyd of Prescott; Harris, the founder of Knox Church, Toronto; Easton, who organised St. Andrew's Church, Montreal; Buchanan of Beckwith, and Merlin of Hemmingford, belonged to one or other of the branches of Presbyterianism, which united in Scotland in 1820 to form the Secession Church. Rev. Daniel Eastman of Stamford, and Jenkins of Markham, had received their orders from the Associated Church of the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

United States. These were the men that bore aloft the Westminster Standards in Canada during the first quarter of the present century, and earned for themselves the undying gratitude of their fellow-countrymen and co-religionists. They were men of good nerve to begin with, or they would not have ventured to come to Canada at all. But their mettle must have been often put to a severe test. The ministers and people of this generation can form no notion of the hardships their fathers in the colony had to endure. In their own humble homes they had to share in the "green tea and fat pork" of the settlers. The severe cold of winter was offset by the extreme heat and the mosquitoes of summer. And when they went from home, as they often did, to minister to the spiritual necessities of settlements that were not provided with stated pastors, they had to take long fatiguing journeys on foot, there being yet no public roads, any more than conveyances. With the sun for their compass, they set out through the forests, following the "blaze" of the trees—that is, a chip taken off the bark on the side of trees until the white wood is reached—at short intervals, telling the proper direction to take. Shoes and stockings had to be put off to wade through "creeks," as brooks are called in this country, and occasionally they had to swim over larger streams. The risk was considerable of their losing their way. Once they got out of the track of the "blaze," there was no security for their proceeding in the right direction, especially if the sky was cloudy, as the senses got very easily bewildered in a thick wood. This description applies, of course, to the early settlers—at the next stage a horse and saddle-bag became the ministerial equipment for travelling.

These heroic Presbyterian pioneers were also in labours abundant. They had to go far and near to administer baptism and solemnise marriages. It is estimated that Mr. Eastman, who had a roving commission for the entire Niagara peninsula, married not fewer than 3000 couples. The registers kept by Mr. M'Dowell on the Bay of Quinte, for a part of his ministry, show that during that time he had married 2220 persons and baptised 1638 souls. The right to celebrate marriages was an important source of income in those days. The remuneration received by ministers for the ordinary discharge of their functions was both scanty and precarious, and therefore marriage fees were a most valuable perquisite. In Canada it is quite different from what it is in Scotland. The parish ministers at home feel that the tying of the matrimonial knot is at least a profitless task, as no fees can be demanded—a burdensome inroad upon their time that amounts almost to a nuisance. But here it is both law and custom to pay marriage fees to the officiating clergyman in addition to the licence; and it was found that young men who were not in the habit of contributing much towards the support of Gospel ordinances, always made a push to gather a few shillings together for their wedding-day. This was not always the case, however. They sometimes asked credit from the minister who married them, as they did from the shop-

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

keeper who advanced the supplies they needed for their households. The officiating clergyman was sometimes paid in kind, too—the shoemaker promising a pair of new shoes, the tailor a new vest, the miller a barrel of flour, and the farmer a bag chockful of beans after harvest. Such was the life these brave men lived—such was the work they had to do, and they did it splendidly. Canadians of the present day will not willingly let the names of those self-sacrificing clergymen die.

As yet, however, the most of the settlers who had come to Canada had been either driven by constraint of circumstances in the parent-land, or induced by the prospect of lucrative public employment, but not from the attractions of the country itself, or owing to the prospect it held out of affording a comfortable home to the surplus population of the older lands. On the contrary, emigration to this country was considered almost as bad as banishment to a penal settlement. By-and-by, however, more correct information with respect to the climate and productiveness of the soil came to be disseminated among the artisans and small farmers of Great Britain, and the result was that, from 1825 to 1835, a steady stream of immigration set in. A considerable proportion of the new settlers were Scots—indeed, the people north of the Border have always evinced more enterprise in availing themselves of the advantages that foreign countries or the colonies afford than the English have done. This accounts for the fact that, though the population south of the Tweed is five times as great as that of Scotland, the latter has sent a larger number of emigrants, of late, at least, to the colonies than England has.

It cannot be said that any church extension efforts put forth in the colonies, at least at this stage, by the home Presbyterian Churches were born of sectarian zeal, or were the offspring of a desire to be represented in the distant parts of the Empire. There was, perhaps, too little ambition in this direction, for if a Church has a *raison d'être* at home—if it is persuaded that it affords the best shrine for the truths of the Gospel—it seems axiomatic that it ought to strive to extend itself wherever it can, that men everywhere may have a chance to share in its benefits. Instead of the parent Presbyterian Churches doing this when Canada was first opening up for settlement, they only sent missionaries and ministers when they were solicited to do so by the colonists. There was no concerted action by any single Church, much less by the whole of the Churches holding the Westminster Standards, to provide for the spiritual necessities of their co-religionists abroad. Presbyterianism was thus placed at a disadvantage in comparison with Prelacy, the interests of which were zealously pushed by the Church of England, especially in Canada, its centralisation of authority and influence standing it in good stead in such an emergency. That Presbyterianism was not wholly distanced in the race in these circumstances is owing to the tenacity with which people well instructed in the Shorter Catechism hold by their own faith, and the energy of character which is begotten of self-government by Presbytery.

But after the great immigration from Scotland and the north of Ire-

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

land which took place to Canada between the years 1825 and 1835, and the exciting politico-ecclesiastical question known as the Clergy Reserves began to be stirred in this country, the Church of Scotland commenced to take active measures to look after the rights and interests of her adherents across the sea, and to provide for their instruction and government. It was at this juncture the "Glasgow Colonial Society," the forerunner of the "Colonial Committee" of to-day, was formed, having for its secretary the energetic and indefatigable Dr. Robert Burns, then of Paisley, and afterwards of Toronto, to whom Presbyterian extension in Canada owes far more than to any other single man. In the interval I have named, some of the ablest ministers Canada has ever been able to boast of came to our shores, conspicuous among whom were the late Drs. Mathieson and M'Gill of Montreal, Machar of Kingston, Urquhart of Cornwall, and Messrs. Starke of Dundas and Gale of Hamilton, belonging to the Church of Scotland, and the late Drs. George, Taylor, and Proudfoot of the Secession Church. Dr. Cook of Quebec, whose eye has not yet grown dim, nor his natural force abated, and who has been spared to see a United Presbyterianism in the Dominion, and to preside over its first assembly, though set apart for his field of labour the previous year, did not come to Canada till 1836.

It was with the home Churches much the same as with the home authorities of the State,—their first efforts at transplanting their constitution and principles into the virgin soil of the Western world were tentative. Blunders enough were no doubt committed, but they did the best they could ; such a thing as a well-defined colonial policy being as yet unknown, and somehow things stumbled right side up at last. Except in Nova Scotia, where both the Burgher and Antiburgher adherents formed themselves into Presbyteries at the very first, there was no regular organisation among the early ministers, even among those who belonged to the same branches of the Church. Each minister and congregation virtually did what was right in their own eyes, and any responsibility felt was to the church authorities at home. A Presbytery of Montreal in connection with the Church of Scotland was formed in 1803, but for every purpose, except the ordination and induction of ministers, it was practically inoperative, and might as well have been dissolved, as one of the same title, of which no trace further than the name can be found, previously was. In the year 1818, "the Presbytery of the Canadas," composed chiefly of ministers belonging to the Associate Church, was organised, but after a short existence of two years it broke up, and was afterwards replaced by "the United Presbytery of Upper Canada." The semi-ecclesiastical, semi-political question of the Clergy Reserves, around which for many years the battle of the *isms* raged fiercely in Canada, was the occasion of welding together the Presbyterian forces ; but the story of this conflict, and of the more recent consolidation of Presbytery in Canada, must remain to be told on a future occasion.

ROBERT CAMPBELL.

PROFESSIONAL TRAINING IN THE VARIOUS CHURCHES.

THE necessity for a thoroughly educated ministry was never more pronounced than in these days of advanced general culture. The efficient training of candidates for the ministry is, therefore, a matter of urgent and practical concern for all the Churches. Happily the genius of Presbyterianism is not only compatible with efficiency in this department, but has always made it a matter of prime importance and interest. With the view of getting at the actual facts of the case, a short circular was recently addressed to friends in the various Churches, English, Scotch, Irish, American, Continental, and Colonial, requesting information on some points of the course of study required by these Churches in preparation for the ministry. We submit in this paper a digest of that information (so far as received), reserving the opportunity to enter more into detail on particular points, if it should seem desirable.

1. As regards *preparatory education*, we find that a more or less thorough undergraduate course is universally regarded as indispensable, except in quite peculiar individual cases. In the Scotch Churches an Arts' curriculum of four years is the ordinary preliminary, and even that does not exempt the theological entrant from an examination on the various branches studied, unless he is able to present either the M.A. diploma, or departmental certificates testifying his proficiency in certain of the requisites for such a diploma. These latter procure a partial exemption ; but in any case he must be examined in Hebrew and Bible knowledge before enrolment as a regular theological student. In England and Ireland, as also in Geneva and some other Continental Churches, the undergraduate collegiate course occupies three years. In France the B.A. degree is required ; and in most of the Continental Churches this degree is held to supersede the necessity for further preliminary examination in general culture. In America, of which, for convenience' sake, we take Princeton Seminary as the representative, the student must produce a certificate of having passed through a regular course of academic study, or he must submit himself to an examination in the branches usually taught in such a course. No Hebrew is required from beginners, though some knowledge of the rudiments is recommended. In Germany, where the school system has been so well elaborated, the student who looks forward to academical studies in any department has to undergo a searching examination over the subjects which, usually between his ninth and nineteenth years, he has been studying at the gymnasium. These subjects, in the case of all students, include church history and ethics, as part of an ordinary liberal education ; and the examination of theological aspirants further embraces Hebrew, which they have previously studied for several sessions at the gymnasium.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1870.

2. The *term of theological study* in most of the Churches is three years. This applies to the Established and United Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, to the Presbyterian Churches of England, Ireland, and America, and to most of those on the Continent. In the case of the American and Swiss Churches, each session lasts about eight months, divided in two by a brief holiday. To the three sessions of five months adopted by its sister Churches in Scotland, the Free Church adds a fourth of like length, each beginning with November and ending with March. The three English Presbyterian sessions last seven months each. The French Church, in its two faculties of Montauban and Paris, has also four sessions ; the first of which, however, conducted by *maîtres de conférence*, and devoted mainly to the ancient languages, history, philosophy, and patristic, is regarded as preparatory, and is concluded by an examination called "ascension," which each student must pass before entering on his three years of theology proper. The Canton de Vaud similarly makes the first of its four years preparatory to the rest, embracing with subjects analogous to those taken in France, the history of religions, Biblical archaeology, and *encyclopédie théologique*. In Germany the period of theological study varies. In Prussia it is at least three years (six semesters, or sessions), and in Würtemberg four years (formerly five). The winter semester lasts five months, and the summer four. Students of theology, as well as others, frequently change their universities for the purpose of studying under chosen professors. Sometimes, instead of taking more than six sessions, they go home and prepare quietly for the first theological examination.

3. The *order of study* is usually, taken broadly, as follows :—first, exegetical subjects ; then, systematical and historical ; and lastly, practical theology.

As a specimen of the Scotch theological curriculum, we may take that of the New College, Edinburgh, probably the most extensive of any.

<i>First Year's Students.</i>	Junior Hebrew. Natural Science. Apologetic Theology. Evangelistic Theology. Elocution.
<i>Second Year's Students.</i>	Junior Exegesis—New Testament. Junior Systematic Theology. Senior Hebrew and Old Test. Exegesis. Elocution.
<i>Third Year's Students.</i>	Junior Church History. Senior Exegesis—New Testament. Senior Systematic Theology. Elocution.
<i>Fourth Year's Students.</i>	Ecclesiastical and Pastoral Theology. Church History. Evangelistic Theology. Elocution.

All these classes meet daily, except the Evangelistic Theology and the

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

Elocution Classes, which meet two hours and one hour a-week respectively—the Evangelistic Class meeting for only two months.

In Ireland, the first session is given to Christian Ethics, Church History, and Hebrew (which has already been studied for a year in the undergraduate course). The second is devoted to Church History, Theology, and Sacred Criticism; and the third to these two latter subjects along with Sacred Rhetoric, which has attention given to it all through the course. The English Presbyterian course, like the Canadian, resembles the Scotch.

In America, Exegetical studies and General Introduction have stress laid on them in the first year, along with Sacred Geography and Antiquities, and some practice in extemporary speaking. In the second year comes Special Introduction in connection with the Hebrew and Greek studies, to which are added Didactic Theology, the Doctrine of the Church, Christian Ethics and Apologetics, besides an important class for the consecutive and harmonious study of the life of Christ alongside of the exegesis of the Gospels. Most of these subjects, with the exception of the last, are further prosecuted in the third year, a marked feature of which is the minute attention given to Pastoral Care, and to Church Government and Discipline. A model Presbytery for the trying of supposititious cases is formed among the students, who are in this way familiarised somewhat with the forms of process before they are actually ushered into ecclesiastical life. It is possible for Princeton students to receive license, on examination, at the close of their second year; but this is given on the understanding that their studies will be continued at a home or foreign seminary for another session. And it should be added that provision is made, on the other hand, for a post-graduate course, to those who wish a fourth year of study before entering on active ministerial life.

In Germany, the order of study is not rigidly defined, much room being left for individual choice. Students generally, however, begin with Church History, Exegesis, and Philosophy; then take Biblical Theology, Dogmatics and Ethics, History of Dogmas, Symbolics, and Introduction; and, finally, Homiletics, Catechetics, Pastoral Theology, Liturgics, Church Constitution, and the like.

In Holland, the Government course includes, along with other subjects, Christian Ethics, and the study of what is called the Literature of the Israelites, and the Literature of the Early Christian Church. The curriculum of the Netherland Reformed Church embraces a study of that Church's own history, and a course of Ecclesiastical Law, besides a class (corresponding somewhat to the Evangelistic Theology Chair in Scotland) devoted to the History of Christian Missions.

In Neuchâtel, besides teaching the ordinary subjects, attention is given to Biblical Archaeology and to what is called Pastoral Hygiène, individual, social, and moral (*l'hygiène au point de vue pastoral*). One pleasing feature here, perhaps only possible where the number of students is small,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

is the fortnightly *Soirée Théologique*, held alternately at each of the professors' houses, where a paper is read by one of the students on a theme which is then thrown open for discussion. Special care is bestowed in the Independent Church of Neuchâtel, and, indeed, in the Presbyterian Churches of the Continent generally, on Practical Theology, or, as it is called in Berne, Pedagogy and Pastoral Prudence. This is studied under the three heads of Catechetic, Homiletic, and Pastoral.

In Geneva, as in the Scotch curriculum, Apologetics comes early in the course, and Homiletics near the end. Symbolic Archæology is here added to the ordinary branches.

It should be noted that provision is made in most of the colleges for the student taking one or more of his sessions abroad, should he find this desirable and convenient. The interchange of Christian sentiment thereby gained tends to the happiest results, both on the individuals and on the Churches to which they belong; and it is satisfactory to know that this privilege, so much valued in the earliest days of our Reformed Churches, has been taken advantage of with increasing frequency of late years.

4. Certain *prescribed discourses* have to be prepared by the students of all the Churches during their theological course. Without counting class essays, these are in Scotland usually six, of which all but the second are likewise required by the English Presbyterian Church—viz., a homily, a controversial thesis in Latin or English, a critical Hebrew exercise, an “exercise and addition” on a passage in the Greek New Testament, a lecture, and a popular sermon.

In Ireland, the students, besides preparing class essays, deliver a sermon to the Professor of Pastoral Theology, an exercise and addition to the Professor of Sacred Criticism, and two discourses each session to the Professor of Theology.

In America, each member of the junior and middle classes delivers a brief discourse, *memoriter*, in presence of a professor and the students of his year. A longer discourse is read by students of the middle class; while students of the senior class have to conduct a regular service in the seminary chapel, including a sermon, which is delivered without notes, and is subjected to criticism in the class next day. Then, prior to graduation, each student has to submit two lectures and four popular sermons, for the approval of the Professor of Homiletic Instruction.

In France and Switzerland, dissertations are similarly prescribed, and in some cases a prize is awarded to the best effort. In Canton de Vaud, each student must furnish and deliver five sermons, on texts prescribed by the Professor of Practical Theology; likewise two catechetical exercises, two expositions in the form of practical exegesis, and two analytical exercises—all of which are suitably distributed over the course. In Geneva, six sermons are required, two catechetical exercises before a jury of professors and students, and one French dissertation—besides recitations, analyses, and minor homiletic exercises.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

In Germany, there are "practical seminaries" where the students have to preach and catechise, and to prepare sermons both in full and in outline. But such exercises are not regarded as obligatory.

5. Certain *examinations* have in all cases to be passed before the student becomes a licensed preacher, or "probationer," as the name goes in Scotland. In addition to class examinations, an annual supervision by the Presbytery has to be undergone by the Scottish Free Church student, throughout his theological course; and, at the close of his curriculum, he must pass a searching examination on ten subjects prescribed by an Examination Board, which the Assembly appoints from among the eminent scholars of the Church. The other Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, England, Ireland, and America, make similar provision for testing the scholastic proficiency of candidates for licence, though in some cases, as for instance in America, the annual examination by the Presbytery is dispensed with, and the student is held directly amenable only to the College Board, or to the Examining Committee of his Church. In addition to the great exit examination, further final tests of scholarship are applied in the Presbyteries, though, in Scotland, at least, the tendency is for these to be superseded more and more by the thorough efficiency of the Board Examination—leaving the Presbytery to deal mainly with the character, motives, homiletic gifts, and soundness in the faith, of the various applicants.

In the Universities of Scotland, there are examinations for the degree of B.D., but these are not essential for license.

In France, each student must pass the "Semestriel" examination, at the close of each session; and at the end of the third year comes the examination for the B.D. degree (*Baccalaureat en Théologie*), on gaining which the student has only further to be "consecrated," in order to be eligible for a charge. For this degree, six written compositions have to be handed in, on prescribed subjects, and an oral examination on them undergone. Then a thesis must be publicly delivered, on a subject left to the choice of candidates.

In Geneva, whose Oratoire is much frequented by students of the Free Church of France, there are monthly examinations, and a general examination at the close of the course, on passing which, and presenting a satisfactory thesis before the jury of examiners, the degree of B.D. is obtained.

At Neuchâtel, if the student does not apply for licence after, at most, six years of theological study, he is regarded as having relinquished all intention to do so. Applicants must hand in an account of their studies, up to the date of their last annual examination. Then they deliver a thesis before the commission, and submit to oral or written examination on Bible Criticism and Exegesis, Systematic Theology, and Ecclesiastical History. Some latitude is allowed to the student in choosing what books of Scripture he will "profess" for exegesis. But in addition to all the above, he has to deliver certain other exercises, including two trial

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

sermons to be each prepared, and, if possible, committed within three days, besides the liability to undergo further examination, if it should be deemed proper, in order to consecration.

In the Canton de Vaud, the students have to pass sessional examinations as in France (and, we might add, America). Not sooner than at the end of six semesters, comes the general examination in all the great branches. These may be taken separately or together. Having successfully passed in all, and handed in the requisite exercises, the candidates for the diploma of licence are further submitted to examination, before a jury composed of members of the education committee and of the council of the faculty. Each applicant must preach on a text prescribed six days before ; hold a "catechism" on a subject announced twenty-four hours before ; give an exposition of a small portion of Scripture, selected for him two hours previously by the professors ; and hand in and defend a thesis, on a subject chosen by the student himself.

In Germany, no examination is absolutely required during the theological course, except for the allocation of bursaries. After six to eight semesters, the "first theological examination" in all branches, is passed before the consistory, a professor, and two other deputies. Those who succeed in this receive the *licentia concionandi*, constituting them curates or assistant preachers. One result of the Church and State conflict (Kultur-Kampf) in Germany, has been that a State examination (Wissenschaftliche Staatsprüfung) on subjects of general culture has to be undergone by all theological candidates, before members of the consistory, and of the provincial board of education. At an interval of two years, comes the "second theological examination ;" this time *pro ministerio*, and again in all branches of theology. It has to be preceded by a brief training in the "schoolmaster seminaries," and in it special emphasis is laid on practical departments, such as Church constitution and pedagogics.

C. A. S.

SCOTTISH MODERATISM AND THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

OURS is not a political publication, and in a catholic and ecumenical magazine it is desirable that mere questions of party politics should find no place. Accordingly, in noticing an article in the *Quarterly Review* for July, entitled "Why is Scotland Radical?" I avoid dealing with the political aspects of the question urged, though upon these my views are possibly as distinct as those which I decline to criticise. Radicalism may be a very good thing or a very bad thing in itself, and its application to the questions before a certain Presbyterian country may be either extremely mischievous or highly beneficial. We are entitled to put all that aside. But there are some things which we are not entitled to

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

put aside. When, under the guise, or even for the imagined purposes of political action, a broad attack is made from England upon the whole genius and life of Presbyterianism, and, what is more, upon that life of religion which has in the past given to Presbyterianism its truest strength, and which in the future can alone make it worth preserving, the case is changed. Whether such a representation be made by a political opponent or a political ally is no matter ; in this journal we are called to deal with it on its ecclesiastical side. *Interest reipublicæ* ; it concerns the Presbyterian world that, whatever Scotland may do with her politics, she shall not suffer her religious history to be travestied and her religious future to be compromised.

Not even by the *Quarterly Review*. That important literary organ has of late years been quite equal to its old reputation, and in the special region of enjoyable historical memoir, it has maintained an exceptionally high standard. But human nature when maintaining a high standard requires occasional relief ; and we in the northern part of the island have long found—and that not merely at election times—that our English friends, who on other subjects are thorough in their studies, unbutton their minds and accept easy trash on the subject of Scotland. To begin by applying these words to the present article would be rash and premature ; and, indeed, it would not be wholly true, for whatever else the *Quarterly* article is, it is not easy in tone. It proposes a grave question ; it gives a bold answer ; and it shows a strong animus in supporting it. What is the answer of the *Quarterly* to its own question ? It is that the Radicalism of Scotland has a “peculiar foundation of its own,” which is to be sought in her ecclesiastical relations. These have always formed “the keystone of her politics,” and down to this day their “guiding influence.” But that influence, with an exception during one brilliant period, has been most deleterious. The policy of the older Dissenters, sprung from the secessions of last century, has been thoroughly bad. That of the Free Church has been worse, so much so, that to be rid of the fanatics of 1843 “was no loss to the Church established, if she were not tempted to imitate or rival their ways.” But, unfortunately, the Established Church too has of late years fallen under the influence of a party which has persuaded it to move by overwhelming majorities in the same direction. What is to be done with a Presbyterian country whose politics depend on its Churches, and whose Churches have, with complete or nearly complete unanimity, been leading it on a ruinous course ? Nothing but to tell it the truth. The broad issue at present, says the *Quarterly*, is simply, “Is the Moderate party to prevail ?” And by the Moderate party is not meant, as is carefully pointed out, merely the party of moderation in a general way ; for that virtue is unfortunately claimed by the majorities of all the Scottish Churches, as belonging to themselves, and as the proper way in which their convictions must be worked out. The article is devoted to setting up the Moderate party, in the historical and technical

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

sense of the name, as the true ideal for the Church of Scotland in all its branches. That party, it is said, has been represented as having consisted "only of a worldly and careless clergy," but it was in reality, as established in the end of last century, "the most wholesome party in politics and religion that Scotland has yet seen." To that party, as it formed one of the "two distinct camps" in the Church a hundred years ago and more—of one of which Carlyle of Inveresk is here taken as leader and historian—to that Moderate party is owing all that is best in the traditions of Scotch Presbyterianism. From them the Church received what was called New Light in theology, and freedom from fanaticism in social life; while their great thirty years' "work" in the Assembly, as reduced from 1751 onwards to a system for enforcing obedience, especially in the settlement of presentees upon resistant presbyteries, is singled out for particular praise. In recent years, on the contrary, the two measures by which the majority of the Established Church of Scotland has most sinned against the old Moderate ideal, to whose policy, it is said, "she had reverted for nearly a generation" after 1843, were, the abolition of patronage, and the appointment of a committee to confer upon union with Presbyterians outside. "To the former measure, either in its general policy or in its details, we have not one word of praise to give. It was a surrender of all that was best in the Church of Scotland. . . . Nothing could more tend to denationalise the Church." And the latter is still more contemptuously denounced, as deserving and demanding failure; and as, it is to be hoped, the last attempt at that "policy of truckling" which contrasts with the energetic rule of Robertson, Home, and Carlyle in the age gone by, and which is therefore "unworthy of all that associates the Church with what is best in the history of Scotland." We make these quotations in order to prove to those who have not read this remarkable manifesto—what some of our readers in Scotland would otherwise have difficulty in believing—that it is not the prudent virtue of moderation, but Moderatism, and that in its full historical realisation and development, which is set up in the present day as the refuge and the ideal of Presbyterianism in Scotland.

This being the thesis of the article, we are bound to say of it that it explains nothing; that its conclusions as to the past history of Scotland are broadly false; and that its proposals for the future are singularly unfortunate.

In the first place, this is an article which explains nothing. We do not suppose that any single reader in Scotland will imagine that it answers the question which it puts—we mean that it explains the Radicalism of Scotland either on the religious or the ecclesiastical side. But, indeed, it goes to the roots of nothing. One circumstance is conclusive on this point:—it commences the religious history of Scotland in the year 1689. Now, there was absolutely no religious history that commenced then. There are no ecclesiastical *principles* even, which had not their origin and their most characteristic form long

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1870.]

before that date. If Scotland is now Radical, politically or religiously, in any sense in which it can be distinguished from other countries, that is owing wholly—not partially, but wholly—to what occurred before the date at which the *Quarterly* commences its search for an answer. And this refusal to go back to the origin, or incapacity to go down to the roots, of anything in Scotland, is the explanation of the most prominent and most offensive characteristic of the article. Great indignation has been excited north of Tweed by a paper which not only advocates the policy of the old extreme Moderatism, but reproduces its spirit of bitter attack upon earnest religion in every form in which it has appeared in Presbyterian Scotland. The animus of the article, it is said, is the worst thing about it. But what can you have except animus, where you have no attempt at understanding or appreciating what is assailed? An attack upon the religious history of Scotland by one who apparently has never heard of Knox, who ignores alike the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, and who in those that follow strikes indiscriminately at every green thing that rises above the soil, can never be of historical value. We concur in thinking this paper worthless, not by any means because its judgment of religion in Scotland is false, but because, apart from that final judgment, its treatment of the whole question sinks far below the level of appreciation which modern writers, even the most hostile, have established in dealing with religious movements and religious men. We do not say that the Scottish type of religion, old or new, is worthy of being followed. But we do say that it is worthy of being studied—by those who intend to write upon it. Take the nearest parallel. Dean Stanley's Scottish Lectures in 1871 were not supposed to be an historical success. They were upon a subject new to their author, and one not perhaps the most congenial. They had the same animus, and they maintained substantially the same thesis, with this article. But they really attempted, notwithstanding the strongest prejudice, to attain a clear idea of the personal and social type of religion dealt with. And hence the representatives of that type find in them, with many defects and a general drift in the wrong direction, hints and suggestions of very considerable value. It is quite otherwise with the present article. From beginning to end there is nothing to be got from it. But it is nothing to say that it falls beneath the standard of the English churchman. No intelligent Scotsman can dip into it after reading—say, St. Beuve, or Renan—without wishing that the *Quarterly* had entrusted its sketch of the religious history of his country to some third-rate writer of those wholly unchristian schools. We should then have had a strenuous endeavour to understand our historical form of religion and devotion, and a discriminating estimate of it so far as understood. As it is, the author, displaying a maximum of animus with a minimum of appreciation, has remained wholly outside his subject. He has nothing to draw with—and the well is deep.

Let us take the two chief points in his delineation of Scottish religion

—its origin, and its contrast with fully developed Moderatism. Its origin, as I have said, he seems to consider to have been in 1689. At all events this is how its history is commenced, and how the Presbyterian Revolution is described :—

"Episcopacy had been the established form of ecclesiastical government for twenty-nine years; and it was in 1689 the religion of two-thirds of the people of the country, and of the great mass of the landed gentry. Presbyterianism had to make up lost ground by an intensified zeal of dogma. Whatever these years of persecution had taught, they had at least taught nothing of toleration. Presbyterianism lost no time in beginning the work. The pent-up zeal of the Covenanters rushed forth all the stronger for having been so long restrained. No sphere of society or politics was free from a prying introspection. The places of the deprived clergy were rapidly filled by men drawn from the lower orders, who made up for their lack of education by an excess of orthodox zeal. The laity vied with the clergy in the exhibition of obtrusive piety. The popular element in the Church was encouraged to excesses of which those to whom the management of political affairs was entrusted knew well how to avail themselves. Superstition and bigotry found assistance even more valuable than that of priesthood, from the fury of popular zeal. The Act of Union did not in any way diminish this tendency. It drew off into a larger sphere the few whose influence, confined to Scotland, might have told in the direction of moderation. The struggle was left to the more extreme of both parties. The defeated factions were driven into Jacobitism : the dominant Presbyterians became more exaggerated in their claims to supremacy. It would not be easy to parallel the history of the thirty years that followed the Union. We find a clergy, little respected and with little claim to respect, who nevertheless, through the Church courts, exerted an almost unquestioned sway over private life and conduct. We find the mass of the people inflamed with the zeal of orthodoxy, and tending to diverge into sects by their very emulation in forging the heaviest fetters for free thought. We find an aristocracy dishonest and unscrupulous in public life, and debauched in their private morals, who yet affected, with an exaggeration of hypocrisy, the guise of sanctimonious religion."

Now this, we say, is a fancy picture, drawn partly from the violent and most untrustworthy memoirs of the Scottish Episcopilians of that day, and partly from a still more questionable source. We say nothing as to the probability that the church government preferred by two-thirds of Scotland and nine-tenths of England,—a government, too, which the new king was willing to retain in both countries—should have been thrust aside against both his will and theirs. We prefer to point out that there is not the smallest historical ground for the leading suggestion of the paragraph, that there was among the Presbyterians "an intensified zeal of dogma," or a more "inflamed zeal of orthodoxy," or a greater enthusiasm than there had been among them in the Puritan and Covenanting time which immediately preceded, or still earlier and back in the days of Knox. The fact as to Presbyterian history we believe to be the converse. Whatever else those years had taught, "they had at least taught something of toleration" of a nobler or a baser kind ; and from the very

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

first day of the new settlement of affairs this was manifest. And it became much clearer during "the thirty years that followed the union." Instead of the people and the clergy being inflamed by a zeal and emulation of orthodoxy during those years, the most prominent characteristic was the contrary—a gradual cooling in zeal, while the form of orthodoxy was retained; a cooling which was the true historical precursor of the bitter Moderatism which succeeded, and which "burned frore" into the chilled heart of Scotland. The fact, we venture to think, is "familiar to all who have studied the history of Scotland during the first thirty or forty years of the last century;" and though the admirers of Moderatism will characterise it in other terms from those we have chosen, they of all men are bound to trace it in grateful detail. And, undoubtedly, we should have had it done in this article, were it not that Episcopalianism shares with Moderatism in producing its animus. Presbytery was not becoming warmer than before, but it still remained warmer than the preceding Episcopacy; and, therefore, in the interest of the "deprived clergy," we have here a contrast drawn with new men "of the lower orders," with a "lack of education," and "little claim to respect." Here, again, we say, the representation is traceable to a source opposed to history. Changes undoubtedly had occurred during the hard times of Charles II. and James II.; but neither had the Presbyterians sunk nor the Episcopilians risen so as to make a contrast with the state of matters described by Burnet long afterwards as "the fatal beginning of Episcopacy." He was himself, he says, even then "entirely Episcopal;" he had at the Restoration given in his adhesion to the new system, and when he had become a bishop in later years he describes the ousted Presbyterians of 1660 in terms which reveal at once his respect and his dislike. But what does he say of the Episcopal "clergy" who took their place? "They were the worst preachers I ever heard; they were ignorant to a reproach; and many of them were openly vicious. They were a disgrace to their orders and the sacred functions, and were indeed the dregs and refuse of the northern parts." It is a true instinct which sends the writer in the *Quarterly* back to that "deprived clergy" of whom these men were the early representatives to find the precursors of Moderatism. Some of them were more than precursors. It should not have been forgotten that many of them were not deprived at all in 1689, but on the contrary conformed and contributed to that relaxation of morale which commenced very soon, and which was to have a miserable culmination. But so much for the accuracy of history as it is restored in a *Quarterly* of 1879.

And now as to its appreciativeness. Whether the energy of Presbyterianism was intensified or relaxed after its establishment in 1689, there is no doubt that it presented both before and after that time a very distinct and recognisable type of religious profession or experience. And that type, as has been confessed by every writer since Mr. Hallam, has been the great peculiarity about Scotland and the key to its history down to the

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

present day. We have said already that this article makes no attempt at understanding that religion of Scottish Presbyterianism which it selects for its subject. What, then, does it say about it? It says, as we have seen, that from the first the clergy and laity vied with each other in obtrusive piety, and that the aristocracy as a consequence became dishonest and debauched, and at the same time sanctimonious. It goes on to speak of that "corruption of society, which was contemporaneous with the sudden triumph of the Covenant." It selects, apparently as an illustration of this influence of the Covenant, "the well-known and infamous Colonel Charteris." It sketches a type of character where hypocrisy was "deeply ingrained," and where men "varied their scenes of drunken debauch by meetings for prayer and pious conversation," admitting only that from this type there were "not a few exceptions" in the Church, and these exceptions were some of the early Moderates. When these came to form a "distinct camp," their endeavour was to free social life from the "sanctimonious hypocrisy which threw under the guise of an apparent asceticism." The other camp, who were originally seemingly the whole Presbyterians, are now called the "High-flyers," and their characteristics are "bitterness, and rancour, and hypocrisy," as well as, of course, ignorance and vulgarity. Indeed, Dr. Leechman, about the middle of last century, was "the first of those who refused to believe that literature and scholarship and taste ought to be banished from the repertory of the Presbyterian Church," which, considering that it was the Church of George Buchanan and Andrew Melville, was remarkable as well as creditable. But, indeed, "his whole life gives us a picture of something new to that Church." Fortunately, the old Presbyterian spirit survived also so that it may be contrasted with the later developments of Moderatism. The "type of the Highflyer" is to be seen in a certain leader of that party, and it is thus compendiously sketched:—"He had no scruples, and, 'with a little temporary heating, had no principle.' With a great appearance of religious strictness, he illustrated the hypocrisy of his party, and was often known to exercise his talent of drinking a company of dissolutes under the table. His sins were forgiven for his orthodoxy, however," and he was accepted as a leader, surely very appropriately, by "the strictly Antinomian party in the Church;" for among the rank and file too, some had "hard work to keep up the *assumed character*." And this, according to the *Quarterly*, is the picture of "the true Wild or the Fanatic," as the Anti-Moderate party ought to be called.

Now this is hopeless trash. The type of Scottish piety in that age—the age of Boston and the Erskines—did not vary seriously from that which has been common in Presbyterian Scotland ever since the Reformation. It is a phenomenon of great bulk, and may be amply studied in masses of books as well as in poor men's cottages down to the present day. But of all methods of explaining it, that of explaining it as being mere hypocrisy is the most inadmissible. It is below the level of

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

any decently educated reader of history. It is equally out of the question in the present century, whether you write from a believing or an atheistic standpoint. Assume that there is no such thing as religion except in the sense of a subjective delusion, and then you can show how, age after age, this unfortunate enthusiasm has misled men, and how the effect of it upon others, and even on the enthusiast himself when he has cooled down, is to produce dissimulation. You can show that, because, from the believing side also, it has been shown again and again in Scotland and everywhere else. Is M. Taine from the materialistic, or George Eliot from the moral side, more elaborate than Shepherd's "Ten Virgins" from the over-spiritual side? But *this* writing of history, if it could be accepted as anything else than special pleading, would be childish. To find the parallel of such treatment of Puritanism one must go back to the filth of the Restoration plays. There, too, the earnest section is always the "Antinomian" section in Church and State; and he who enters the stage with religious strictness does it to "illustrate the hypocrisy of his party." Of course, the "Holy Willie" representation—the extreme contrast of profession and principle—offers the most dramatic type for the poet. Its pungency consists in that very contrast—between the standard of feeling of the party, and the private conduct of a hypocritical member of it. So, the utmost that was alleged against Dr. Webster—and apparently to a large extent falsely—was, that on some occasions he acted to the scandal of those of his own party who knew it in a way in which the leading Moderates acted habitually, to the entire satisfaction of *their* side. And this "illustrates the hypocrisy" of Dr. Webster's party! Such scandals always convey to the religious party a very important lesson. But who, except Wycherly and the *Quarterly Review* in 1879, has ever offered them as an explanation of three centuries of history?

And even the *Quarterly* is only driven into this by its recommendation of Moderatism as the true flag for the present crisis. Any lower position would have enabled it to maintain at least an outward respect for religious earnestness. Had it accepted the religious party in our history as honest, but denounced it as enthusiastic, it would then have laid a foundation on which the philosophic historian could, in his usual way, have set up the opposite side as the representative of caution, reason, and reaction. How much may be done in this way, not only plausibly but truly, may be seen in Principal Rainy's third lecture on the History of the Church of Scotland. There an opponent of Moderatism has sketched its rise with a philosophic delicacy of appreciation which goes almost the length of apology, and which far exceeds the defensive attempts of its friends.* The explanation is that, to a large extent, Dr. Rainy,

* Edinburgh : Maclarens, 1871. Hugh Miller says, in one of his most memorable pamphlets, "The history of Moderatism has not yet been written. . . . Whoever sets himself to exhibit the true complexion of its career, may be assured that he will find his materials grow mightily upon him as he proceeds."

like the Dean of Westminster whom he answers, is content to take Moderatism not as aggressively anti-religious, but as what it originally was, the passive or non-religious element within the Church. And there is a great deal of good in things which, like beef or bread or the human understanding, are non-religious. There is so much good in them, that the Presbyterian party in Scotland has always insisted on the duty of mixing its religion with large proportions of things which the other or Moderate party preferred to enjoy unmixed and alone. But the Moderate party in its turn became active, aggressive, and despotic ; and the despotism of the non-religious element in a Church is simply a living death. And it is precisely this latter state of matters—this and no other, this and no less—which the *Quarterly Review* loudly demands that the Church in Scotland shall revert to. Accordingly, it is driven to take up a position far below that which even the opponents of Moderatism have indulgently suggested that it should claim. Dr. Rainy was careful to point out that the culture of the last century, not informed by religion, produced some characters in certain respects admirable, though as it went on it turned out inferior products like the "coarse and jovial" Carlyle of Inveresk. But here it is Carlyle of Inveresk who is drawn at full length as the model for the rulers of the future Church of Scotland, and it is his despotic enforcement of the law of patronage which is singled out as his crowning merit! And the paean sung over that achievement is introduced, very appropriately, by his own complacent definition of the division of feeling between himself and the people. "There were doubts about my having the grace of God, an occult quality which the people cannot define, but which is in full opposition to the defects they saw in me." That a pleasant and good-natured man like Jupiter Carlyle should habitually sneer at the grace of God, which he preached every Sunday as often as he preached his creed, was nothing remarkable in the Moderate ascendancy. No greater insult could be offered to him and his fellows than to suggest that they even desired to possess that occult quality. What is instructive is to remark how the people, in what the *Quarterly* thinks their "profane," "absurd," and "ridiculous" objection, precisely anticipated the position magnificently vindicated for them in the succeeding century by Dr. Chalmers. We in this generation may sink to what depths we choose. But our forefathers in the last century really believed in a faith in God which they did not see, and which they could not well define; but which manifested itself in curing defects of character as visibly as if it were a pint of claret or something which even their spiritual guides could comprehend. They believed in it, and so long as the Moderate leaders were content merely not to believe in it, they let them alone. But when unbelief became aggressive and dominant, and stalked over the Church to tread out spiritual life in the way which this article praises so highly, then it became the thing which Scotland has ever since dreaded and despised.

Yes, we rejoice to believe that it has become impossible to write up

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

Moderatism. So long as it is confounded with the mere virtue of moderation, the equivoque may puzzle us, but only for a minute. For moderation, as has been said, is a natural gift which individuals of all Churches and parties have shared ; it is the monopoly of no nation or sect, and it does not belong peculiarly to those who value themselves exclusively upon it. There was plenty of moderation on both sides in the earlier part of last century. It was the character of the time, and it is hopeless to make us believe that the moderation of the men who have convictions is worse than the moderation of men who have none. In any case, moderation cannot be the distinction between the parties, though this was suggested in a hesitating way in the controversy eight years ago. The *Quarterly* has made that clear. What it now calls for is the supremacy and the despotism of the Moderatism of the later days of the century—that is, manifestly, of the non-religious element over the convictions which all alike professed. It is, we are glad to think, impossible to make such a demand without revolting the consciousness of Scotland and of Presbyterianism generally ; and, therefore, we have allowed the call to be heard without quoting much history against it.

We must say in conclusion, however, that while a great many statements in it are more or less inaccurate, some are sheer misrepresentations. Take one. We have seen the definition of the Highflyers, as this article designates the party who called themselves the Evangelicals, and whom the later Moderates called the Orthodox. Two great men in this century led that reviving party. One of them is here described as “a Dr. Andrew Thomson, a popular and fanatical preacher, drawn to Edinburgh by a fanatically and financially-minded Town Council, in order to make one of the city churches pay.” But the other was Dr. Chalmers ; and though he was far more deeply implicated with the party than his noble predecessor, it seems to have been thought unsafe to say the same thing of him. But something must be said. “He rashly and to his own regret threw in his lot with the Highflyers.” It is purely and wholly false. Dr. Chalmers took the lead of his party in Assembly questions with the courts and the civil power, and to the end of his life he held it his honour and praise to have done so. But that, and all mere external association or exertion was, in his view, a small matter, compared with the great question with which of these two parties his “lot” and that of Scotland should fundamentally be. For he had belonged to both, and his change of lot was a thing which he scarcely ascribed to himself. Down to his last hour he held that the supremacy of the one party constituted the “dark age of the Scottish Church ;” while to leave it for the other, —or rather, as he preferred to put it, to be transferred from it through that occult quality the grace of God,—he never ceased to represent as the dawn of an endless day, alike for the individual and for that nation which is now again solicited by voices from the Darkness.

ALEX. TAYLOR INNES.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1870.

NOTES OF THE DAY.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN AUSTRIA.—We wish again to direct special attention to the subject of religious liberty in the Austrian Empire. The most difficult kind of grievance to deal with is when a privilege is granted nominally, and virtually withheld. The paper by Mr. Dusék in our July number showed that this is to a great extent true of religious liberty in Austria. In the present number, Mr. Moody, now of Pesth, gives fuller explanations of the events referred to by Mr. Dusék, while Professor Balogh of Debreczen shows how much the cause of the Reformed Church in Hungary is impeded by the restraints placed on the action of the Church. The conversion of Austria to toleration was just somewhat too sudden. The Empire had for long ages occupied so contrary a position that it was very doubtful whether it would honestly and faithfully carry out all that liberty of worship and toleration imply. Conversions made under pressure are too apt to be evaded. Pharaoh will allow liberty of worship to Moses and the Israelites while the plague is raging, but when it is abated, he is apt to harden his heart. We should like to see the press generally taking more note of such things as are now going on in Austria. For ourselves, we feel it to be something to let in a little daylight on the proceedings complained of, and expose them in some degree to the influence of public criticism. It is more, to be able to call on the Churches everywhere to remember the case of their oppressed brethren, and pray for them, that God would be pleased to turn the hearts of all to allow in practice the rights guaranteed by law. It is one of the uses to which the Presbyterian Alliance may well direct its energies to claim justice for the feebler Churches who have so many foes, and at hand often so few friends.

MR. WHITTIER'S POEM AND THE WALDENSES.—At a time when the Presbyterian Council is trying to rally the friends of the ancient Waldensian Church in favour of a movement to increase the very scanty stipends of the pastors, it may be well to bear in mind that in no country has the history of the Waldensians made a deeper impression than in the United States. “The Israel of the Alps”—one of the most popular histories of the Waldensian Church—was written by an American. If Milton’s famous sonnet continues to stir hearts everywhere, the lines of an American poet—J. G. Whittier—have probably come next in deepening interest in the Waldenses. The poem has a peculiar history. A paper in an American journal by the Rev. J. C. Fletcher, informs us that thirty years ago, while he was studying at Geneva, a Waldensian fellow-student came to him one day and read a French poem, entitled “Le Colporteur Vaudois,” which he had found in Vinet’s *Chrestomathie* of French Literature. The poem became famous in French, and for a time its origin was unknown. It was known to have been translated from English, but even Dr. Baird, an American author, ascribed it to a London paper—the *Observer*. It was some time after, that Mr. Fletcher found that it was written by his own countryman, the Quaker poet—John Greenleaf Whittier. Thereafter, on visiting Mr. Whittier in his house at Amesbury, he was told by the poet that he had been more moved on hearing that the Vaudois Teacher (as the poem was called by him) had touched the Waldenses, and been adopted by them in all their schools, than by any other piece he had ever written for any purpose whatever.

The poem was suggested to Whittier by a passage written by Rhenarius Saccho, an inquisitor of the twelfth century. We subjoin the passage and the poem:—

“The manner,” says Saccho, “in which the Waldenses and heretics disseminated their principles among the Catholic gentry was by carrying with them a box of trinkets, or articles of dress. Having entered the houses of the gentry, and disposed of some of their goods, they cautiously intimated that they had commodities far more valuable than these

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1870.1

—inestimable jewels, which they would show if they could be protected from the clergy. They would then give their purchasers a Bible or Testament; and thereby many were deluded into heresy." Here is the poem—

"O lady fair, these silks of mine are beautiful and rare—

The richest web of the Indian loom, which beauty's queen might wear;
And my pearls are pure as thy own fair neck, with whose radiant light they vie;
I have brought them with me a weary way—will my gentle lady buy?"

And my lady smiled on the worn old man through the dark and clustering curls,
Which veiled her brow as she bent to view his silks and glittering pearls;
And she placed their price in the old man's hand, and lightly turned away,
But she paused at the wanderer's earnest call—" My gentle lady, stay!"

"O lady fair, I have yet a gem which a purer lustre flings
Than the diamond flash of the jewelled crown on the lofty brow of kings—
A wonderful pearl of exceeding price, whose virtue shall not decay,
Whose light shall be as a spell to thee and a blessing on thy way!"

The lady glanced at the mirroring steel where her form of grace was seen,
Where her eyes shone clear and her dark locks waved their clasping pearls between;
"Bring forth the pearl of exceeding worth, thou traveller gray and old,
And name the price of thy precious gem, and my page shall count thy gold!"

The cloud went off from the pilgrim's brow, as a small and meagre book,
Unchased with gold or gem of cost, from his folding robe he took;
"Here, lady fair, is the pearl of price, may it prove as such to thee!
Nay, keep thy gold, I ask it not, for the Word of God is free!"

The hoary traveller went his way, but the gift he left behind
Hath had its pure and perfect work on that high-born maiden's mind;
And she hath turned from the pride of sin to the lowliness of truth,
And given her human heart to God in its beautiful hour of youth!

And she hath left the gray old halls, where an evil faith had power,
The courtly knights of her father's train, and the maidens of her bower;
And she hath gone to the Vaudois vales, by lordly feet untrod,
Where the poor and needy of earth are rich in the perfect love of God.

"PESSIMIST PULPITEERS."—This is the nickname given by a London newspaper to preachers who insist much on human depravity, and hold that this depravity is becoming more and more apparent, and that everything is going to the bad. In spite of these melancholians, the newspaper believes the world is growing better. There is hardly any question to which the remark applies more truly than this one, that much may be said on both sides. The truth is, that the world is growing better in some respects, and worse in others. A fair view of the case would bring out discriminatingly the various directions in which there is progress toward good and progress toward evil. And we hardly know a greater service that could be rendered to society at the present time than a fair statement of both sides of the question. If the Presbyterian Council wished a somewhat lively discussion, it might afford an opportunity for such an inquiry. There has always been a tendency, on the one hand, to think "the world is very evil, the times are waxing late," while, on the other, more sanguine minds dwell on the progress and brighter symptoms of the times. Poets as well as pulpitiers have mourned over

"A world that seems
To toll the death-bell of its own decease;
And by the voice of all its elements,
To preach the gen'ral doom."

Cowper wrote this nearly a hundred years ago, and many would hold it entirely appropriate to the present day.

VIVISECTION.—The vivisection question has been revived in England by the speech of a not very discreet prelate in the House of Lords—the Rev. Dr. Magee, Bishop of Peterborough. The *Spectator*, a warm opponent of vivisection,

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

and of far too high intellectual calibre to be pooh-poohed, has met the Bishop on the subject of his definition of cruelty, and the Bishop has had to defend himself. Miss Frances Power Cobbe pours on the Bishop a vial full of indignation and scorn. It is evident that this question will not and cannot rest. The University of Edinburgh is known to have lately lost £10,000 intended to be given to it by one opposed to vivisection, and understood to have withdrawn it owing to the experiments of Professor Rutherford, while other sums are believed to have been withheld for similar reasons. We are not disposed to go the whole length of forbidding all experiments on living animals. But we have two very strong and clear convictions on the subject. In the first place, that there is a line beyond which experiments on animals revolt the law of humanity, and are contrary to the purest instincts of our nature. We would not condemn all corporal punishment at schools. But there is a line beyond which corporal punishment (at Dotheboys' Hall, for example) becomes an outrage, a horror, and a disgrace. It is not easy to define that line, either in the one case or in the other. But when it is transgressed, men of healthy sensibility instinctively know it, and are roused. That many vivisectionists have outrageously transgressed it seems to us as clear as day. The other conviction we have is, that physiologists generally have not acknowledged as they ought to have done that the practice as carried on by some is *prima facie* revolting and horrible. They have not allowed for the very natural excitement of humane people, nor recognised the reasonable ground they have to be shocked. They have taken the high horse, and breathed defiance. This seems to us a very false policy, fitted to prolong controversy and embitter feeling. It is high time the tone were changed.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORLD.—There is something worth notice in a poem under this title in an American paper, by Matilda C. Edwards. The conception of the poem is very happy, though the execution halts somewhat. The design is to illustrate the tendency, in these times, for the Church to join hands with the world, and drift with her down the stream.

“The Church and the world walked far apart
On the changing shores of time,
The world was singing a giddy song
And the Church a hymn sublime.
Come, give me your hand, cried the merry world,
And walk with me this way.”

The Church refuses—then consents; gets ashamed of her simple white dress and plain house; and adapts her fashion to the world's taste.

“And fairs and shows in the halls were held,
And the world and her children were there;
And laughter and music and feasts were heard,
In the place that was meant for prayer.
She had cushioned pews for the rich and great
To sit in their pomp and pride,
While the poor folks clad in their shabby suits
Sat meekly down outside.

“The angel of mercy flew over the Church,
And whispered, I know thy sin;
The Church looked back with a sigh, and longed
To gather her children in.
But some were off in the midnight ball,
And some were off at the play,
And some were drinking in gay saloons,
So she quietly went her way.”

The world then persuades the Church to accept her innocent sports—sneers at her hard preachers preaching damnation and woe—commends the gentlemanly men that preach universal restoration—and the Church agrees. Then the work of faith and labour of love are slyly depreciated—why waste time and money on

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

such rough, ungrateful creatures as the poor,—enjoy yourselves and improve your ways of living. And the Church yields here too. Then,

“The angel drew near to the mercy-seat
And whispered in sighs her name,
And the saints their anthems of rapture hushed
And covered their heads with shame;
And a voice came down through the hush of heaven
From Him who sat on the throne,
‘I know thy work, and how thou hast said,
I am rich, and hast not known
That thou art naked and poor and blind
And wretched before my face;
Therefore from my presence I cast thee out
And blot thy name from its place.”

THE LATE PROFESSOR LORIMER, D.D., OF LONDON.—It is with the deepest regret that we have to record the sudden death of Dr. Lorimer, Professor in the English Presbyterian College. Dr. Lorimer was a man whose solid excellence of character was balanced by his solid acquirements in theology and theological literature. He was one of the founders of the English Presbyterian College, and one of the most laborious professors of his time. To church history he was particularly devoted, and his writings were chiefly in that department. He wrote a Life of Patrick Hamilton, a History of the Scottish Reformation, and more recently, a work of much original research, “John Knox and the English Reformation.” His translation of Professor Lechler’s *Wicif* was noticed just the other day in these pages. He was preparing for the press a rare discovery, “Minute-Book of the early Protestant Church of Frankfort,” of which Knox was once the minister. Some of his other discoveries in old libraries have been very wonderful. Dr. Lorimer was present at the Edinburgh Presbyterian Council, and read a paper on the “Desiderata of Presbyterian History.” He was appointed convener of a committee on this subject; and in our last number we had occasion to refer to the interest excited in it, as evinced by the great contribution of Professor Balogh. In every point of view, the removal of Professor Lorimer is a great loss.

GENERAL SURVEY.

GERMANY.

By Rev. J. E. CARLYLE.

MISSION topics occupy a considerable place at present in Germany. The Hermannsburg separation from the Hanoverian Church continues to be discussed with animation. It has led to division of opinion both in the Hanoverian ministry and among the Christian laity; and politics have also had, no doubt, their place in this. We are certainly no supporters of Pastor Harms in the extreme position he has taken as regards civil marriage. And we may add, that Presbyterianity has always respected, in this, the rights of the State. At the same time, Christianity at large must recognise the noble work carried on with so great self-sacrifice by this mission. German Christianity, indeed, recognises this, and treats with a just forbearance the Hermannsburg Mission. We read with interest what the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* writes on the subject. “The Hanoverian separation,” it says, “grows here and there. The withdrawal of the Epiphany collection has not injured it, it has rather increased its funds—we mark the very notable receipt from 1st January to 22nd February of no less than 45,539 : 84 marks (about £2270), and of 41,365 : 48 marks for special objects (about £2068).” It adds with generous feeling: “We can only rejoice at this, and see that under

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

God's hand even division may serve to His honour. May the money be spent for His glory—above all things, may not the strife we have at home be extended to the heathen." God grant, we may add, a gracious answer to this truly catholic prayer.

Referring to missions, I feel obliged to notice a pamphlet by Dr. Wangemann, the worthy superintendent of the Berlin Mission, regarding the station of Saaron, in South Africa.* A resolution was passed by the General Presbyterian Council that the Churches "represented at it should steadily aim at brotherly co-operation and combined action in all their mission operations." This aim, we may say, has been fully carried out in the action of the South African Committee formed at that time during the meeting of the Council. They have done since what they could to promote mutual understanding and co-operation. And we may add that the good understanding arrived at betwixt the Berlin Mission and that of the Canton de Vaud indicates how catholic a spirit rules in our Presbyterian councils. I feel bound to state, knowing something of the missions of South Africa, that the Berlin Society has not had justice done to it by the Colonial Government, either as regards Pniel or Saaron. I am very far indeed from charging Sir Bartle Frere with this, believing, as I do, that no one has a more hearty desire to act justly, and, at the same time, kindly, as regards Christian missions. The German missions in South Africa have done noble service—the Rhenish, the Berlin, and the Hermannsburg. They have ever favoured, also, in the limits necessarily assigned to them, our colonial action. I shall add here that the magnanimous conduct of the German Emperor William in declining the protectorate of the Transvaal merits recognition. The rights of the Berlin Society as regards property have been called in question. I have no doubt these can be legally substantiated. Of course property in South Africa has, as everywhere else, risen greatly in value. We know ourselves of colonists who bought for £5 what is now worth £5000; and so with mission property. But an honourable Government cannot make a distinction here, more especially as mission property is far more than private even, dedicated to the noblest philanthropic ends. There is not a farthing the Berlin Mission can save which does not go to the propagation of the Gospel in South Africa. I have noticed with interest, in the last report of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, that an aged Australian bishop has bequeathed the magnificent sum of a quarter of a million to endow the main institutions in his diocese. This, we believe, arises from the valuable property he has left. He had "some sixteen valuable stations in New South Wales and Queensland."† On what grounds are other missions not to be allowed the same benefit? I cannot but add, regarding this mission topic, on what warrant has there been an Anglican bishop consecrated to the Transvaal? The Boers there cling with tenacity to the Dutch Church; the scattered English residents are, to a limited extent, Church of England; the missions, German especially and Swiss, are immeasurably preponderating—indeed, we know of no Anglican missions in the Transvaal. Does this mean, that wherever there is British rule, we are to have an English bishop? We must frankly demur to this conclusion. The system has been too far conceded as regards the British Empire. There is nothing in our political system and government to warrant this principle, that wherever we rule, Episcopacy is to occupy the paramount place.‡

Referring to missions, we would notice here some very able papers which have lately appeared in the *Conservative Monatschrift*, by the Rev. Dr. Warneck, on the relations betwixt the Modern Missions and Culture. Dr. Warneck is the editor of the *Allgemeine Missions Zeitschrift*, which may be justly regarded as the

* *Denkschrift betreffend die gewaltsame Auflösung der Berliner Missions Station Saaron in Sud Afrika*, Berlin, 1879.

† Society for the Propagation of the Gospel Report for 1878, p. 66.

‡ The navigation laws require that the Church of England prayers be used. This has been interpreted as if English clergymen had alone a right to conduct service on board ship. We are aware that the Peninsular and Oriental Company does not act thus, but other oceanic companies do—as we have the means of showing if necessary.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

ablest mission journal of the day. The articles to which I refer have excited considerable attention and interest in Germany. They are a masterly reply to the sneers of the *Globus*, the *Kosmos*, the *Gartenlaube*, the materialists of Germany, with some of our own popular English writers, as to missions. They furnish also some fresh and valuable statistics as to mission work.

Lord Macaulay has somewhere said that he who would do ought to lower Christianity, commits high treason against the civilisation of humanity. Dr. Warneck would show that Christianity and Christian missions are in fact the highest power of culture. Even Hellwald, the fanatical supporter of materialism, grants that our modern culture rests on Christianity. But it is argued that the mission of Christianity is only temporary; science, in its progress, has won a greater position, and Christianity is now a hindrance to higher culture.

Dr. Warneck shows how false this is, viewed in the light of modern mission history. The modern materialistic school limits culture to the physical and mental, the ethical is repudiated as an empty sound. Such a civilisation as this, Dr. Warneck justly argues, is only a civilised barbarism, such as the wretched Socialism of Germany, or the Nihilism of Russia. Culture is something higher; it is the development of all the gifts and forces granted to man, by which he rules nature, and not only contributes to his own temporal well-being, but ennobles his mental and moral faculties. This includes thus, the physical, mental, and ethical. These views may be considered abstract, but they are not without their importance at the stage which the whole argument regarding missions has now reached. But we follow Dr. Warneck rather in the practical line of his argument. And first, as regards the *physical*, he shows what the modern mission is effecting among the savage races of the world. It meets them, as nothing else has done, in their nakedness, filth, and debasement. It has clothed them, and taught them the decencies of life. Trade, production, industry follow in the path of the missionary. Dr. Warneck notices the work of Dr. Moffat among the Bechuanas; the same results are shown among the Basutos. Among the rude tribes, where the Rhenish mission has done so noble a work in South Africa, in Polynesia, and among the Indian tribes of North America, missions have effected more than this. To elevation, they have added stability. A naval commander, sent out lately to put an end to the kidnapping system in the South Seas, gives it as his testimony, that wherever he found missions and the missionary, there was quiet, friendliness, readiness to engage in peaceful trade. The progress which the aborigines thus make is remarkable. Everywhere the native Christians, recently but savages, are rising to such a position of material progress as to support not only their schools, but their native pastors. Mission facts thus demonstrate ever more clearly that the right way to promote material culture and elevation—the only way, in fact, which has succeeded—is by appealing, as the missionary does, to the deeper and nobler feelings of our nature.

But there are civilised as well as uncivilised heathen races, as in India, China, and Turkey. Even here missions are exercising an important influence on material elevation. The culture of these peoples is often over-estimated. There is a civilisation, but it is of the past. It has lost the freshness of its life. It is rather stagnation—a civilisation in its ruins—gigantic, yet but ruins. The great masses, too, are sunk, notwithstanding it, in abject poverty. This is true even of India, not the fault, indeed, of the British Government, but the result of its superstitions. A new life is needed before there will be the enterprise of business or the skill of invention. An influential Japanese, a man of insight, told an American missionary Japan needs more than your railways and steamboats, your telegraphs and machines, your law and your science—the hearts of the people must be changed. It is Christianity thus alone that can inspire a civilisation not of mere mechanism, but of spontaneous and real culture.

But the influence of missions, however important as to physical elevation, is far more conspicuous as to *mental* culture. Missions are the greatest educational institutions heathen races have ever known. The need of publishing the Word of

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.

God in the vernacular tongues has been not only of immense service to philology, as a Müller, a Benfey, a Pott readily own—but what is of far higher value—the tongue of the native has been enriched, and his thoughts expanded and ennobled by Holy Scripture. By the latest information of the London Bible Society, the Scriptures have been translated into 303 tongues, and in the course of the century sixty to seventy languages only spoken before, have been raised to the character of written tongues. The translations have not, indeed, been all such classic productions as the German or English Bible. Still, if like Wycliffe's version, they may have been but pioneers, the mental results, as regards culture, have been immense. Besides, how many other Christian works have been produced. In India, from 1862 to 1872, 3410 works have been printed in thirty languages, of which 2,375,000 were school-books. The London Tract Society circulates in the same way millions of publications in some 120 different languages. The American Board has published 2300 works in forty-six languages, besides 11 periodicals.

Then there is the mental results of mission schoolwork. In India there are 143,000 scholars in mission schools, with 1600 pupils who have passed the entrance University examination. In the South Seas, the London Mission Society has 590 schools, and the Wesleyans, 1697. In Madagascar the London Missionary Society has 745 schools. In all, it is reckoned that in the mission schools of the world amounting to about 12,000, there are some 400,000 pupils. It belongs to this subject, also, the number, so rapidly increasing, of native pastors and teachers. Dr. Warneck reckons the number of native mission helpers now at 22,000 to 25,000.* The results of so large an educated population as we have described, and of so many native mission agents cannot but tell largely on the mental culture and elevation of the world.

Dr. Warneck refers lastly to *ethical* culture, which is the highest, and as regards which mere civilisation has done so little, and missions are doing so much. It is here that the missionary has achieved his noblest work. It is thus, for instance, that wherever a mission has been established, there is a deeper sympathy for the poor, the sick, and the infirm. Even the heathen natives, as the Parsees, or the Hindus of Bombay, and other parts of India, have been thus inspired to establish hospitals on a magnificent scale. The mission has also been the saviour of human life—counted as nothing by the heathen. Meinecke, Waitz, Gerland, Oberländer, and even Darwin, own that it is Christianity in Polynesia which has saved its people from cannibalism, human sacrifices, child-murder, and has made either an end of war, or at least mitigated its evils. Then, there is the moral action of missions on the life of woman by its female schools, its Zenanas, and the whole results of the presence of Christian women, such as the wives and daughters of missionaries, on native society. This has been more than instruction—it has been the culture of the heart, bringing with it that purity and elevation which are the life of the family. It is the mission which has successfully struggled with polygamy, the evil of children's marriages, the sale of women, the murder of the widow, or that contempt for her, which in India has so degraded her being. Civic life, too, has owed much to the mission. The wretched despotsisms of savage tribes such as the Kaffirs or the Zulus cannot long co-exist with it—the desire of liberty is enkindled. It is to this, for instance, the Sandwich Islands owe their independence and their free constitution. It is working in the same direction in Madagascar and everywhere as Christian missions advance.

Dr. Warneck concludes his able articles with a well-balanced view of the relations of our higher civilisation to missions. He admits the benefits which have accrued. While it was to the simple, earnest evangelical motive we owe the beginning of missions in the early part of this century in Great Britain, America, and Germany, mission work has been facilitated, as in no other age, by commerce, by discovery, by the steam-engine, the steamer, and the railway. These have brought the most distant tribes near to us; the railway in India is doing

* The statistics I have given are almost exclusively Dr. Warneck's.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

much to break down the influence of caste; political events, such as the opening of China, and even the Turkish wars have opened a door for the Gospel; and the extension of the British Colonies and of the United States rule is ever bringing new races under the influence of the Gospel. And then these forces of modern civilisation, if sometimes wielded by the antagonists of Christianity, are not so always. There are traders and traders, governors and governors, and many engaged in world-wide enterprise, or mighty rulers as a Lord Lawrence and so many more, using their influence for the Gospel.

But there is the reverse of the medal. The impulse of modern civilisation is often egoistic—one of unmitigated selfishness—not of the love and beneficence of Christianity. Slavery and its horrors, the entrapping of the South Sea Islanders, the wretched opium and brandy or rum trades, are instances of this, with all the shameful actions which the love of self, and luxury, and licentiousness often induce on the part of the trader and the colonist.

But there is still another injurious influence of our higher civilisation. Our European culture is the product of ages, and it cannot be imparted at once. Seven-mile boots will not advance real culture. The result of contact with barbarous peoples or races long degraded, is often to lead to a mere superficial civilisation, the caricature of the true; such as may be seen at Sierra Leone, or in South Africa, or in India among its more cultured races, or in China or Japan—such an assimilation is enervating. Every unnatural spring forwards avenges itself. True life can only grow slowly. For this reason it is a great advantage a native mission agency trained in Christianity, yet not abandoning its nationality. The results of such begin already to be seen, I think, in India and in China. Our native converts have their own ideas of Christian work and evangelisation. We may trust that in the end thus Christianity, which does not obliterate any people, but embraces all nationalities, with all their special gifts and genius and culture, may bring all their tributes of gold and myrrh and frankincense to the Lord. We have given an imperfect outline of this able and eloquent vindication of Christian missions.

We should fail in this notice of Christian Germany did we not notice here an interesting religious festival which took place in Berlin on the 18th of June last, in the presence of the German Emperor and Empress. Both of them are evangelical Christians, clinging earnestly to the faith of the Reformation. No ruler of this age, indeed, or we might add of almost any age, has given his testimony more firmly and nobly, with all the spirit and gallantry of a Christian soldier, than King William in these later years of his life.

The occasion of the festival was the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of an important theological institute connected with the Berlin cathedral. It is called the "Königliche Dom Candidatem Stift." It is intended for the special careful higher training of theological students, of whom some ninety now reside in the walls of this hall, and enjoy its benefits. It owed its foundation to Frederick William, the late King of Prussia—all whose wishes regarding it his brother King William has piously and affectionately sought to carry out. For its present efficiency it is much indebted to Dr. Hoffmann, whom those of us who have visited Berlin will recall—the able court preacher, the distinguished theologian, and the superintendent or ephorus, as he was called, of this institution. Dr. Kögel, not less eminent as an evangelical preacher, theologian, and higher Church official, now occupies his place.

On this occasion there was a large gathering of the leading evangelical ministers of Berlin, its higher Church authorities, and its Christian laity. An earnest and able discourse was delivered in the College Chapel by Dr. Kögel. At the close there was a gathering in the Common Hall, when the Emperor spoke, and his address will long remain, I doubt not, in the memory of the students of the institution, and of Evangelical Germany. I can only quote a few leading sentences:—"What alone in the movement of these times can give fixity is religious faith—the only foundation of which is laid in Jesus Christ. Do not

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1870.

join yourselves to those who reject the Bible, the alone source of truth, or falsify its words by their arbitrary interpretation. You know all of you, gentlemen, that I cling with full conviction to that positive Church union which my father, now with the Lord, founded. The foundation on which I and we all must build is the uncorrupted faith which the Bible teaches us. I know that there are many who do not pursue the way of which I speak. I respect, honour, and bear with them. Every one must act according to his best knowledge and conscience. May heaven grant, gentlemen, to all of you that this day may be blessed to the recognition of God and of His only begotten Son Jesus Christ, as the alone source of true salvation." "Remain by that which alone remains firm. Each one may act as his conscience tells him, yet all must be built on the foundation of the Gospel. If that be done, to each of you will be opened, in his own way, his field of work." So earnest and faithful a testimony as this will surely be a blessing, not only to Germany, but to the world. Rarely, if ever, has the Kaiser spoken thus.

ITALY.

Letter from Sig. MEILLE.

FLORENCE, July, 1870.

I INTEND to devote this letter to a modest but useful society whose quiet and unobtrusive work has been very beneficial to the missionary operations of all denominations in Italy, I mean the *Italian Evangelical Publication Society*, at the present having its headquarters in Florence.

It was started as an indispensable auxiliary to the general mission work as soon as the new state of things in Piedmont made it possible for the Waldensian Church to come out of its old mountain fastnesses and to evangelise in Piedmont. I have beside me the minutes of the first meeting held at La Tour in the Waldensian Valleys on 1st November, 1855, attended by several ministers and laymen, in which it was resolved to form a *Religious Tract Society for Italy*, independent of the "Table" and the Synod, but still closely connected with the missionary operations of the Church. Among those who signed these minutes, many, after a hard day's work, have gone to their rest; but others we have still with us, and hope to have for many a year.

The new society was first established in Turin, with Mr. Meille, the Waldensian evangelist of that town, acting as secretary. They set vigorously to work, and in a short time a good number of books and tracts, on different subjects, had been published. Besides that, the Society helped in the publication of a religious newspaper entitled the *Buona Novella*, and of an Italian translation of Dr. McCrie's work on the *History of the Reformation in Italy*. The gift, by some Christian ladies in Dublin, of a small printing press, helped considerably in the furtherance of the work, especially as the Italian printers, from fear of the priests, were rather shy of printing evangelical books. At the same time, an evangelical bookseller's shop was started in Turin for the sale of the Society's publications, and colporteurs were sent throughout the provinces to disseminate them far and wide.

In 1860, that is to say when the largest part of the Italian peninsula had been opened up to the preaching of the Gospel, it was thought advisable to move the *Claudian Press* (such was the name given to the evangelical printing-office in honour of Archbishop Claudius of Turin) farther south, and accordingly it was sent to Florence. The Society was formed anew, Dr. Revel being president, and the Rev. J. R. M'Dougall acting as secretary. The vaster field opened to evangelistic energy required more powerful exertions, so that almost year by year the *Claudian Press* received new additions, and became more and more known in Italy. The *Buona Novella* gave place to another paper called the *Echo of Truth* (*Eco della Verità*), under the able editorship of the late Dr. Desanctis, who soon made it the most important organ of Protestantism in Italy. To Dr. Desanctis also is to be ascribed the honour of writing and publishing the most

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

widely diffused of all the Society's publications. I allude to his calm, clear, and forcible controversial tracts and books, some of which have been translated into several foreign languages, and have been the means of leading many a soul to the truth as it is in Jesus.

In a few years the work became so important that it could no longer be prosecuted through the voluntary exertions of the ministers residing in Florence, and the necessity of a fixed agent, devoting to it all his time and energies, was felt more and more every day. Mr. M'Dougall then resigned his voluntary and gratuitous secretaryship, to which he had always devoted a great deal of his time and talent, and a fit substitute was found for him in the person of a young minister of the Free Church of Scotland, the Rev. James B. Will, who has been ever since the principal and most efficient agent of the Society. Later on, the writer was appointed to act under him, as editor of the Society's regular publications.

The history of a Publication Society does not present many striking and interesting incidents. The works do not show themselves in statistics, and it is almost impossible to form an adequate estimate of the good done by the dissemination of tracts, religious periodicals, and even larger publications. But I feel perfectly justified in saying, that there is no church, no missionary denomination of any kind in Italy, that has not derived the highest benefit and help from the publications of our Society. It is not to English or American readers that it is necessary to explain all the good that can be done in this way, for the great advantages that both America and England have derived from the religious press are too obvious to leave any doubt on the subject. What the English and American Tract Societies have done in their respective countries, the *Italian Evangelical Publication Society* is trying to do here, although on a much more limited scale, but still with a very considerable amount of success.

The enterprise is at present presided over by that indefatigable friend of Italian evangelisation, the Rev. Dr. Stewart, of Leghorn, and directed by a Committee formed of members of different denominations. It has, besides two dépôts opened for sale in Florence, other shops in different towns in Italy, and many colporteurs sell its publications throughout the country.

If I were asked to give a sketch of the publications themselves, I should say that the most important and perhaps the most effective portion of them are the religious periodicals published under the superintendence of the Committee. One of these publications is intended for adults, and is called the *Famiglia Cristiana* (The Christian Family), an illustrated paper for Sunday reading. The monthly *Amico dei Fanciulli* (Children's Friend), as the name indicates, is devoted to the young, and is widely diffused, not only in Protestant schools and families, but also among Roman Catholics, who, in many instances, have declared that they like it very much. Both these papers have a good circulation.

Another important publication of this Society is the almanac entitled the *Amico di Casa* (Friend of the Household), an illustrated little volume of 112 pages, which has now reached the twenty-sixth year of its existence. Although it has to compete with publications of this class of every form and style, from the fly-leaf to the richly-bound and illustrated volume, it still continues to hold its place as the most widely-circulated almanac in Italy. Some years ago the English periodical *All the Year Round*, in a study on Italian almanacs of the present day, gave it the very first place of all. Last year no less than 32,000 copies were sold throughout all Italy. More or less, the same number has been sold for more than a quarter of a century; and if we keep in mind that not one of the twenty-six volumes can be perused without learning the way of salvation through faith in Christ Jesus, we will not find it difficult to understand all the good that it has done in the cause of Italian evangelisation. A proof of its usefulness in disseminating the truth lies in the fact that no sooner is a new almanac issued than the priests publish in several parts of Italy confutations of its articles of a religious character. The *Vero Amico di Casa*, in Florence; *L'Amico di Casa Smascherato*, in Prato; the *Giam Paolo*, in Verona, and others, present themselves "with

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.

the avowed design of preserving their readers from the so-called *Amico di Casa*." This fact proves that our little almanac is not one of those enemies that the Roman Catholic Church despises. Certainly it is the most far-reaching agent in the whole work of Italian evangelisation. It is not too much to say that it carries the truth to at least a hundred-thousand readers, scattered not only in Italy, but also in foreign lands.

A companion to the *Amico di Casa* is another almanac, called the *Streuna dei Fanciulli* (The Children's New-Year's Gift), which has now been published for seven years, and has found its way in many quarters which no evangelical publication could reach. Here, also, the religious teaching is the main object; but, at the same time, it contains papers on natural history, poems, interesting stories, and biographies.

Besides these regular publications, the Society has issued already a great number of books and tracts. Many of these are translations either from the English or the French, but many also are original compositions. It would be impossible to speak, even briefly, of all these publications. Suffice it to say that the most popular tracts of England and America have been spread by our Society in this country, and can be had at any of our shops for much less than what they cost in England. I do not exaggerate in saying that nine-tenths of the books, tracts, hymn-books, religious papers, Sunday-school literature, which are in use among the different Italian denominations, have been printed, and are being circulated by this Society, so that all the Churches are really indebted to it for a considerable portion of the success which their missionary efforts have achieved.

If I did not fear to make this letter too long, I could give many instances of the good that these different publications have done, and are doing. But the readers of *The Catholic Presbyterian* are too well acquainted with the power of tracts in spreading the truth. It is therefore quite unnecessary for me to dwell upon that.

But there is one point that I must be allowed to advert to. Religious publications and tract distribution are nowhere remunerative concerns, and in Italy even less than anywhere else. All the publications of the Italian Tract Society are really sold at a loss, which is sometimes very considerable. And as the Society never send collectors to Protestant countries, it follows that it has sometimes the greatest difficulty in continuing its operations. The last report shows a deficit of 15,217 fr., that is to say, of £600 sterling, which is a very great drag on its work. Permit me, through your columns, to ask the friends of Italian evangelisation to remember this useful Society in their donations.

I shall conclude my letter with items of news of a different kind.

Last week the session of our Theological Waldensian College in Florence was closed, after the usual examinations, presided over by the Rev. M. Prochet, of Genoa; the Rev. Dr. Stewart, of Leghorn; the Rev. Dr. Lantaret, of Pomaretto; and the three professors. The result of these examinations proved most satisfactory, not one of the fifteen students failing to pass, and most of them acquitting themselves very creditably. Five have finished their *curriculum*, some of whom will go to foreign countries to perfect themselves, whilst others are ready to enter already in the mission-field. It is a very good omen for the future success of the Waldensian Church, that every year it can give about half-a-dozen young ministers, fully qualified by their studies, to preach the Gospel to their Italian countrymen.

I told you in my last letter that sites or buildings had been provided last winter for the Churches of Rome, Verona, and Guidizzolo. I am happy to add to the list the two very important towns of Naples and Milan. In both these places, I have good reason to believe, suitable temples will be provided before long; the contract for the site or building being on the point of being signed. This year will be for the Waldensian Church a very eventful one in the way of buildings. Let us hope that the spiritual building of the Church, made with living stones, will also proceed at the same rate.

A. MEILLE.

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

AUSTRIA.

Letter from Rev. A. Moody, of Pesth (formerly of Prague).

It is told of an Emperor of Austria of a former time, who was very fond of pigeons, that when the magistrates of Vienna issued a prohibition for the inhabitants of the city against the keeping of pigeons, he said to his servants, "Shut my pigeons up for a fortnight, they may fly again after that ; the magistrates will have forgotten, they will have other things to think of by that time." In speaking the other day with a gentleman well versed in Austrian history and politics, of the vexatious prohibitions to which the agents of missionary societies have been recently subjected, I was amused by his answer, "It will be as with Ferdinand and the pigeons ; all that is wanted is a little yielding and a little patience, and there will be free scope to fly again." I am afraid, however, that matters are now more serious ; there is evidently more at present than local grievance and passing trouble, the measures of repression have been so general, so varied, and so extensive, that one can hardly have any doubt of the fixed intention of the authorities to crush the development of free Christian effort. The only thing which might lead one to think that the arrest may be of short duration, is the idea that the Government may have other things to think of before long. The subjects of the Empire are indebted for much of the liberty they enjoy to the pressure of external trouble.

In an article published in *The Catholic Presbyterian* this month, Pastor Dusék of Kolin has described recent grievous restrictions on Protestant freedom. It may be of advantage to indicate more particularly the circumstances in which foreign Churches have been placed, and the methods taken to render their work impossible. The ecclesiastical laws of Austria do not recognise any religious bodies except the Roman Catholic, the Greek, the Lutheran, and Reformed Churches, the Unitarians and the Jews. The existing bodies, however, are invested with rights and privileges which give pastors in their respective parishes great power. The Free Church of Scotland entered many years ago into correspondence with the Bohemian Reformed Church, and as it was justly regarded as a matter of the highest moment that friendly relations with the existing Churches should as far as possible be maintained, it was the endeavour of the missionaries of the Free Church to prosecute their work among Jews and others in such a way as to strengthen "the things which remained," rather than to raise a new structure. In 1871, a hall was opened in Prague for the services of the Free Church Mission, with a view especially to the public preaching of the Word in the German language. The superintendent of the Reformed Church had given his consent, and the opening services took place under his sanction. The pastor of the Bohemian Reformed congregation in the city was not favourable, but he did not offer decided opposition, as the language was to be German, not Bohemian. When I arrived, however, towards the end of 1871, I found that the Lutheran German congregation was not satisfied, our German preaching being regarded as a trespassing on the ground of which it had possession. As a matter of fact, the German Protestants of the city had attached themselves to it as being the one German congregation, so that it had come to have the designation United Lutheran and Reformed. This being the case, we resolved that, as it was not our intention to form a separate German congregation, it would be well also to avoid occasion of collision, and we arranged accordingly to have English preaching at the forenoon diet and German in the afternoon, when, as a rule, there was no service in the other church. This arrangement appeared to give general satisfaction, and our place of worship soon came to be known as the English Hall.

In 1872, the missionaries of the American Board arrived. In the autumn of the year following, they opened a hall for Bohemian meetings, Pastor Schubert of Krabschitz having obtained, in co-operation with them, permission from the police for himself and friends to lecture on religious subjects. The movement awakened

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1870.

interest, and Bohemian Protestants and Roman Catholics came in increasing numbers to the meetings. But the pastor of the Bohemian Reformed congregation soon came to the conclusion that this Bohemian lecturing was an invasion of his rights, an intrusion into his fold, as all the members of the Bohemian Reformed Church in the city and the surrounding district were by law committed to him exclusively for edification. He applied to the Supreme Ecclesiastical Court in Vienna for an interdict to restrain Pastor Schubert from interfering with the edification of his parishioners, and obtained it. The result was, that the allowance granted by the police to Pastor Schubert was withdrawn, and the hall opened by our American friends was for a time closed.

The success of the Bohemian pastor was not unnoticed by the German congregation, and the inference was obvious that if, in the one case, the authorities gave the pastor power to suppress the labours of another in his parish, they might be expected to do the same in the other case also. Our German meetings had developed, and though held only in the afternoon, were largely attended. I was in the habit of advertising subjects which I thought might interest the Jews and the public generally, and our hall was often filled. Then we invited lecturers of note from a distance, and had large audiences in one of the chief halls of the city. The jealousy of our neighbours in the German Church was awakened, and was soon fanned into a flame. During the summer of 1876, the German pastor and his elders lodged a formal complaint against me at the office of the Governor of Bohemia. It was to the effect that I had no warrant to hold Divine Service in the German language in the parish without their sanction. The consequence of this was, that I was summoned to the police office, and examined as to the legal basis on which our work was carried on. I made a statement, which was taken down by one of the clerks, and signed by myself. It was sent up to the Governor's office, but, as it contained a virtual appeal to the superintendent of the Reformed Church under whose sanction our hall had been opened, it was at once communicated to the Supreme Ecclesiastical Court at Vienna. That body now called on the superintendent to furnish explanations. He did so at great length, and in the main, I think, admirably. The Vienna Council, however, sent an equivocal answer to the Bohemian Government Office, indicating vaguely, but sufficiently for the purpose, that the sanction of the superintendent was not enough without the concurrence of the pastor of the parish. The result was that, in March, 1877, I received notice from the magistrates prohibiting my preaching in the German language without the permission of the German pastor.

I have no doubt that the State pastors were gratified to find themselves in possession of such power. The Government granted them unlimited authority in their own domains. The poor Protestants had the power of the sword in their hands to protect them against all invaders! They did not see the purpose of the enemy. There were wheels behind wheels. The Central Government was but too glad to have an obnoxious Protestant movement thwarted and put down by Protestants. Mr. Dusék has remarked with truth that, while some might regard such action "as a protection favourable to the Protestant Churches, this is a palpable error, as these Churches are protected only so long as they keep silent and motionless."

I had occasion to go to Vienna to the office of the Minister for Religion and Public Instruction, and had a long conversation with the Ministerial Secretary, Dr. F. I was surprised to find that he was minutely acquainted with all our arrangements and movements. He said he understood that I had conducted a deputation of Bohemian pastors to the Presbyterian Council in Edinburgh, and added that, while no one could prevent the pastors having a holiday, the Government could not allow that they were in the proper sense deputies of their Church. He referred to the operations of the foreign societies, and said that no services were legal except those conducted by ministers of the Churches recognised by the State; even our English services, he said, were not legal. The English Church at Carlsbad, he remarked, ought, for example, not to be open to any but the strangers from England for whom it was intended; others attended it, but this could not

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

easily be prevented. The subject of religious lectures delivered under act of allowance from the police having been touched on, he said that it was the duty of the police to withdraw the allowance in any case in which it might be found that the delivery of such lectures disturbed the peace of the religious communities of the city.

The police authorities at Prague had not, however, as yet received full instructions, and some of the gentlemen with whom we had directly to do—in particular, Councillor D. (since removed by death)—were personally favourable to our work. Mr. Adams, of the American Mission, found, after the Bohemian meetings had been stopped, that what could not be got within the Church, if the pastor opposed, could be got outside of it by one standing on independent ground. The concession was withdrawn from Pastor Schubert because he was a minister of the Helvetic Confession. But was not Mr. Adams a preacher of another Confession? If it were also Helvetic, was it not North American Helvetic? Was not that quite another thing? So argued Councillor D., gave the foreigner permission, and the Bohemian hall was re-opened. So after our German preaching had been prohibited by the magistrates, I received permission from the police to lecture in the same way. I had been driven from the Church ground, from the Helvetic enclosure, but Councillor D. found that there was still room for me when I said to him, "Put me down as of the Scottish Helvetic Confession." After an interval of six months, our hall was re-opened for German meetings. The day of re-opening, 11th November, 1877, was a day of great rejoicing among us, and I continued under the new arrangement to hold German meetings regularly till March, 1878, when, at the call of our Church, I returned to Pesth.

The liberty granted by the police has since been withdrawn. It has been withdrawn from the Americans; it has been withdrawn from our Church. Meetings held outside the pale of the State Churches have been suppressed in Vienna, Prague, Gratz, and elsewhere. Laws which received a more liberal interpretation before, have been explained in such a way as to deprive the foreign bodies of all standing ground.

At the close of my interview with the Ministerial Secretary above referred to, that gentleman said to me that he was much interested in the matters which had formed the subject of conversation. It struck me that he just interested himself in our concerns too much, and I have been reminded, in recalling the circumstances, of the answer given by Dr. Craig long ago to the Governor of Moravia, who received him very kindly, and asked him what he could do for him, "The best thing your Excellency can do for us is to leave us alone."

ANDREW MOODY.

PESTH, HUNGARY, 24th July, 1879.

H U N G A R Y.

Letter from Professor BALOGH, Debreczen.

THE First General Assembly of the whole Hungarian Reformed Church which seemed to be coming near us at the end of last year, and of which we entertained great hopes, has retired again and again from our sight, like a far-off phantom of the air. The five separate bodies into which the Hungarian Reformed Church is divided regularly hold their separate synods without even being represented in any one body,—without even neighbouring synods sending corresponding members to one another. Since the Reformation of the sixteenth century, the integral parts have never been convened in one Assembly. Many would like much to see a union of the sister branches of the same Church, but the realisation of that union cannot yet be counted on as near. All the five bodies (districts or superintendencies) elected their committees; the five committees, called in our mode of speech *convent*, came together, worked together, prepared the plan of a common constitution and discipline; but when the plan appeared in the press, and the public was called to pronounce its judgment on it, many powerful voices were heard against the union projected. The famous pastor at Budapest, who is at the same time superintendent of a large district, Rev. Paul Török, wrote an article in a leading church paper, in which the projected General Assembly—the means of

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1870.

union—was assailed and criticised with great keenness and much irony. The chief argument is, that this period of political excitement and trouble is not favourable for holding a General Assembly; therefore we must wait. Another expression of opinion came from a pastor of Debreczen, Rev. Emmerick Révész, who, though he took the initiative of union, is not satisfied with the proposed basis and constitution, so that he too is inclined to postpone the calling together of the First National Synod. From the side of the *convent*, only one feeble voice defended the plan; several presbyteries voted on the side of adjournment; and under these unfavourable conditions, we fear that the union question stands postponed *ad Greas Calendas*.

What are the principal grounds of this change of sentiment? There are many. The first is of a dogmatic nature. Debreczen, and the men who are concentrated around it, wish to stand firm by the leading doctrines, and favour the old confession. Budapest, and the party adhering to it, desire to be free of all confessional dogmas, approaching somewhat the fashionable rationalistic tendencies of the day. A second reason is found in the political state of our country. The so-called Evangelical party is regarded by some as identified with the ministry of the State now in power, while the Rationalistic party are held to be of the opposition. In such a state of things, few hope that there would be agreement regarding the ecclesiastical organisation. A third cause of distrust lies deep. Each separate superintendency—there are five of them—has had its independent autonomy for three centuries, and thus they would like to retain their old legislative rights and power, fearing to sacrifice anything for the common or central Synod. Without some sacrifice or compromise of this kind, no solid and stable bond of union can be realised.

The division into five independent governing bodies is a hindrance to the development of a great common action; we maintain, for instance, five colleges, while if we were united, three would be sufficient for our want. The same is true of many other things; the expenses, when reduced to the scale of three, would be so much the less. If one superintendency desires to initiate a scheme extending to the whole, or bearing on foreign countries, she cannot do so without the consent, legally and formally obtained, of the other four; and it will readily happen that some good scheme, introduced by one, does not find favour with all the rest. All common operations are thus hindered—we may say, rendered impossible. We have no missions, no Sunday schools, no tract societies, no Bible societies, no Lord's-day societies; but if the five bodies were concentrated, much might be done in these directions. In general, any proposal issuing from Debreczen is resisted, or at least not favoured by Pest, and *vice versa*. No sense of oneness pervades our ranks; and without this unity, brotherly love and confidence in our Church will droop and fade away, while Romanism, with its united force and front, waxes stronger day by day. In convent schools for girls, founded by bishops, and conducted by nuns, there are to be found many girls connected with the Reformed Church.

Politically, we are also fearfully divided. In our extensive history, it never happened before that we had for Prime Minister a chief curator (lay president) of a reformed superintendency; there are other Protestants also in the Government, and yet, in such a country as ours, where the Protestants are as one to five of the population, our Protestant ministers are unable to effect any visible good for their brethren; they cannot hinder the Romanising schemes. In France, where the Protestants are relatively not so numerous, the popish party require to struggle for their power. In our country, on the other hand, we shall be constrained to witness our ancient church freedom and autonomy daily losing something, and the Government of the State, under the pretence of control and “suprema inspectio,” cutting it short, and taking it away. The political Government had from the beginning a large influence and right of oversight in Roman Catholic ecclesiastical matters, because the great estates and revenues are still enjoyed by the Catholics; we Protestants are deprived of all kind of State

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

support, we are left to our own resources ; till now we enjoyed freedom, because of our poverty ; but the new conception of the omnipotence of the State will bring us under its control without giving anything in return. The Reformed Church maintains its ancient rights and autonomy, and this is the chief cause why the Protestants form a great opposition to the Government, and the day cannot be distant when C. Tisza, our premier, will lose all sympathy from the side of Protestants, notwithstanding that he was at one time the leader of the cause of Protestant autonomy. To plead for equal rights for all denominations when the ruling Catholic Church is allowed to hold all her rich endowments and gigantic revenues from State origin, seems not to be justice to all. Perhaps if the Protestants should all be driven into opposition, there would be a political union, and a common ground would be found, on which common action might ensue.

The Presbytery of New York lately sent a contribution of 620 dollars on behalf of the Helvetic and Lutheran congregations of Szeged, both ruined by the inundation. In a church journal of Debreczen, I published the Rev. Dr. Howard Crosby's letter. I think that this brotherly act will serve to draw more attention to the Presbyterian Alliance, whose grand idea has made little progress in our country. It is a pity that no committee was formed there ; the superintendency cannot commence it, so that without a committee, the whole affair rests only in the hands of one or two individuals, who have no official commission, nor right to report. As our circumstances stand now, all our five superintendencies must be invited to the next Philadelphia Council, when we may hope that some of them will send deputies. I should be very much grieved if no one from Hungary should be present at Philadelphia from the historic and great church of the Helvetic Confession of Hungary.

FR. BALOGH.

PROFESSOR EBRARD, OF ERLANGEN, AND DR. MATHESON.

PROFESSOR EBRARD has sent us the following, in reply to the paper by Dr. Matheson in our July number. We regret that, accidentally, his letter did not reach us in time for publication in our last number :—

To the Rev. GEORGE MATHESON, D.D.

DEAR SIR,—You have held me of sufficient importance to make my theology and myself the subject of an essay, in which you count me pre-eminent among “the living representatives of what may be called the revival of religious philosophy in Germany.” I am thankful for the compliment, but also ashamed of it. It is in the utmost degree interesting for any man to see his own figure as it reflects itself in the mirror of another man's mind. One learns to know himself better by seeing such a representation of his own thoughts and convictions ; and his attention will be arrested by many of the weak sides which he offers to an impartial critic. But, on the other hand, it is not to be denied that every mirror-image of this kind inevitably possesses something of *subjectif*, and that errors and misunderstandings may creep in, especially when geographical and ethnological differences as well as separation of language add to the difficulties. You, dear Sir, have not escaped the misfortune of misunderstanding some of my sentences, and if I attempt a reply, my motive is not to criticise you, but because, being full of the highest esteem for the Scotch people, the Scotch Presbyterian Church, and Scotch theology, I am not indifferent as to whether or not my opinions and convictions are rightly comprehended in Scotland. I pray you to regard the following lines as written in this spirit.

1. I begin with a trifling historical error. If the University of Erlangen has risen and flourished, this event had no direct connection with the existence of a French Reformed colony in the town. The theological faculty was founded in 1743 as a pure Lutheran faculty, and as a refuge for the severest Lutheran ortho-

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

doxy, which, in the other universities, yielded at that time to the rising pietism. Before 1819 there was no chair for *Reformed* theology; and since it is taught only "*extra facultatem*." The professors were—Krafft (1817-45), I myself (1847-53), Herzog (1854-78), now Sieffert. I myself, a descendant of Huguenot refugees, am now pastor of the French Reformed colony, a post which my father also occupied, and in his veins there ran not a drop of German blood, my mother being the first German member in our family; consequently "a strong connection" does not exist "between the University of Erlangen and Scotch theology," but only between *me* and Scotch theology.

2. Let us now pass on to my theological system. "The starting-point in the theory of Ebrard is the nature of un fallen man. Man was made in the image of God, and the image of God is a trinity. To say that man was created in the Divine image is to say that he was distinguished from all creation by having a tri-une nature." In these words I cannot recognise my own doctrine. Although, like many old fathers and theologians, I used (Dogm. I. § 241) the nature of the human spirit in order to show that the trinity of God involves no logical impossibility, yet I nowhere said that the image of God, in which man was made, was God's trinity, and much less that the tri-une nature of men consisted "in the body, the consciousness, and the self (or substance)." But I said (Dogm. I. § 203) that God determined that man should participate in God's *ethical qualities*—sanctity, blissfulness, wisdom, by giving him a willing, feeling, and perceiving spirit.

3. Further, I must amicably protest against the representation as if "with Ebrard the incarnation of God in humanity were a *self-emptying* of God." In my Dogm. (II. § 393) I said just the contrary. I distinguished the *substance of God* (or His qualities) and His *form of existence*, and I said that, by incarnation, He manifested His *substance* in a new form of existence—viz., in time and space. If you took notice, also, of my latest and ripest book, my "Christian Apology" (Gütersloh, 2nd edition, 1878), you would find (Tom. I. § 142) the following words:—"How can the substance (essence) of God consist in His omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience, *in His relation to the creature*? If so, then the essence of God would consist in the relation between God and that which is *not* God. That which is *not* God—viz., the creature—got his existence by God's *will*. But God's *essence* must consist in that which God was *before and beyond all creatures*. God's *essence* is that by which *God is eternal God*, not the form of His relation to the created beings, consequently not His omnipotence, omnipresence, omniscience. No! His essence,—as far as we are able to pronounce on it,—consists in His eternal *holy love*, which expresses in itself the eternal antithesis of 'I' and 'Thou,' and mediates it eternally. His *will*—to produce a creature which is *not* God—issued then from this tri-une eternal, essential love. Now, it depends on God's theological wisdom into *what* a relation He will enter with His creature. For the first, he has occupied the relation of the *supertemporal* and *superspatial* Creator and Governor of the *temporal* and *space-occupying* creature; but if He determines that His eternal 'Thou' (His Son) shall enter into *time and space* as Saviour, and shall transmute Himself from a *being* to a *becoming*, in order to make a true manifestation here *in time and space*, the *whole fulness of His essence*—viz., of His eternal *holy love*—then the incarnate Son is truly *God*, and is and manifests the *essence of God*."

4. Concerning the dogma of justification, I teach indeed—"a man can only be counted just WHEN he is regenerated;" but nowhere have I said that "the Spirit of Christ becomes a *part* of his spirit," and much less have I denied that "the death of Christ makes him righteous." My opinion is, indeed, quite this, that a man is counted just BECAUSE he is regenerated. I have said (Dogm. II., § 243), "The regeneration is the substantial objective cause of the *justification*, which is *at once complete*, as well as of the *sanctification*, which is *gradually increasing*. Repentance and faith are the subjective condition for both." Regeneration is the cause of our justification in as far as *Christ with His justitia vicaria* becomes ours, the members participating in that which belongs to the head. My main point is

CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

this—that we do not get justification as a matter standing by itself without getting Christ Himself, but that *He* becomes ours along with all that inheres in Him. And this doctrine is not peculiar to me alone, but also the doctrine of many great old Reformed theologians (cf. *Dogm. II.* § 594). For example—*Wendelinus*: *Fides est causa instrumentalis, qua mediator recipitur, . . . est habitus sanctus, quo electi Christum cum omnibus beneficiis ejus sibi applicant* (“Faith is the instrumental cause by which the Mediator is received, . . . is a holy habit by which the elect apply to themselves Christ with all His benefits”). *Pictetus*: *Fides est vinculum nostrae cum Christo unionis* (“Faith is the bond of our union with Christ”). *Heidelb. Catech.*, qu. 20: Only such as by true faith are *engrafted into Him and receive all His benefits*.

5. The following words include an enigma I am not able to solve. You say, “Ebrard tells us that Christ’s death does not remove the sin, but only the punishment of sin; but what if the punishment of sin is sin itself?” What is your meaning? Will you say that God sins when He punishes the sinners? Certainly not! Or will you say that God punishes the sin by sin?—viz., by abandoning the sinner to his sin? But it is only the obdurate and condemned that are abandoned to their sin; elsewhere God punishes the sinner by the thorn of an evil conscience, by his inward misery, by the feeling that he has merited death and condemnation. Now, Christ by His death has delivered us from this punishment, from the guilt and culpability, from inward misery and restlessness, and from the slavish fear and expectation of eternal death. But has He delivered us also by His death *from the sin itself?* and can it be said that deliverance from the sin *is a part of justification?* Holy Scripture says the contrary. “*Being justified by faith, we have peace with God*,” writes St. Paul; and the same apostle writes, “*Let us lay aside every weight and the sin which does so easily beset us*.” St. John also writes, “*If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves*.” I ask, Was St. John justified? or was he not? Surely he was delivered from the guilt and punishment of sin, but he was not yet delivered from the sin itself. Therefore I was right in saying that Christ *has* delivered us by His *death from guilt and punishment*, by the *justification*, and that He *will* deliver us by His *Spirit* from the power of *sin*—viz., by the process of *sanctification*.

6. “The dying rationalism has left to Ebrard a sense of the glory of humanity; the dominant pantheism has filled him with a conviction of the nothingness of individual life.” In these words you attempt, dear Sir, to construct *a priori* the peculiarities of my system. A dangerous attempt! I could not read these lines without a smile. Dare I tell you something about the development of my inner life? In a time when in Germany Christian faith raised its head against rationalism and began to oppose it, I was laid hold of in my twelfth year by the Holy Ghost (although from my infancy I was educated by faithful parents). Filled with dislike and contempt towards rationalism, I studied Calvin’s Institutes before I entered the university. Faithful professors (Krafft, Olshausen, Harless) were my teachers, and I became an adherent of the strongest Calvinism, especially of absolute predestination. Not rationalism, but a long inner combat (1844-51), connected with indefatigable exegetical researches (which I laid down, *Dogm. II.* § 518-524 and § 556-565), brought me to the conviction, not of the “*glory of humanity*,” but of the thorough responsibility of man—in short, to the Amyraldistic theory.

Nor can “a conviction of the nothingness of individual life,” any more than a sense of the “*glory of humanity*,” be objected to me. Any one who reads my *Apology* will find a great resemblance between my intuitions and those of Leibnitz, but certainly not the smallest between me and Spinoza! Pantheism has in Germany no stricter adversary than myself, and individualism no more eager upholder. Again my *Apology* may attest it. To point to the mystical union between vine and branches, the head and the limbs, Christ and those who, with the apostles, say, “*I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me*,” is not to affirm the nothingness of individual life.

[CATHOLIC PRESBYTERIAN, September, 1879.]

Let me repeat, dear Sir, that it was no quarrelsome disposition, but only my regard for and interest in your Scotch Church and theology that put the pen in my hand, when I wrote this reply, and with sincere thankfulness, I am, Rev. Sir, yours very faithfully,

DR. EBRARD.

ERLANGEN, 7th July, 1879.

The following letter has also been sent, on the same subject, by a Glasgow layman :—

Although a layman, and far from being a theologian, I venture, with much diffidence, to doubt the representation given of Scottish theology by the very accomplished author of the article on Ebrard of Erlangen in your July number, page 17.

I refer especially to his discussion of the connection between sin and the penalty of sin. It may be Augustinian doctrine to regard these as one, but it humbly appears to me that it is not Scottish. Rather is it Romish, or at least mediæval, a product of the same fountain from which has issued what the author tells us is Ebrard's own doctrine of the subjective ground of justification—viz., regeneration.

Is it not the case that Scottish Reformation theology has always distinguished between sin and its penalty? These are, no doubt, in one aspect strictly connected as cause and effect, and the latter is not altogether external to the former, nor is it arbitrary. And even in that aspect the penalty of sin may be said to be judicial in the same sense that suffering, consequent on a transgression of what are called the laws of nature is judicial, in respect that the Almighty Lawgiver has so ordered it. And if sin were merely a disease, perhaps this is all that need be said. From the necessities of the case it would operate according to its nature, or in the language of Scripture, "When it is finished it bringeth forth death." But sin is also an act of high rebellion, and must, therefore, be visited judicially in a sense which the mere operation of natural law does not appear to fulfil. Otherwise, I fail to understand the many instances in Scripture history where sin was punished—often there and then—by an overt act of God, and in ways which appeared to have as little connection with the offence as the illustration given in the article of the murderer and the flash of lightning. Where so many cases will occur to mind, it is only necessary to mention as specimens those of Korah, &c., in the Old Testament, and Ananias and Sapphira in the New. It may be said these were typical of the ultimate and natural consequences of sin. Suppose they were, yet to the extent that actual punishment was intended at all, were they not what might be called external and arbitrary?

But my chief objection to the doctrine in question is on account of its bearings on the sufferings of Christ. As I understand it, the Scottish theology asserts that sin was so imputed to Christ that He became liable to and was indeed visited by its judicial penalty. In other words, He bore the guilt, though not the stain, of sin. But the natural consequences of sin, viewed as an operating cause, could not have existed in Him, seeing the virus of sin had no place in that altogether holy One; and, consequently, His propitiatory sufferings were also judicial in a sense which might be called external and arbitrary as distinguished from natural.

The procuring cause of justification, as stated by the learned author, too—viz., the death of Christ—seems to me rather the view held by John Wesley and the Arminians than by the Scottish school, which latter makes a distinction between pardon and justification or acceptance. Neither is it usual with Scottish theologians, I think, to speak of being counted holy on account of what Christ has done, but rather righteous or just. We are reckoned righteous, and made holy.

I have expressed my ideas feebly, I fear, and very likely without the precision and accuracy of one trained in technicalities. In any case, I must apologise for troubling you, but the definitions referred to caused me some little mental disturbance, which I have thus sought to allay.

J. A. S. M.

GLASGOW, 22nd July, 1879.